EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH
INSTITUTE OF
BRITISH COLUMBIA

Report No. 84:8

# ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SELF-IMPROVEMENT THROUGH SOCIAL CLIMATE ENHANCEMENT

Peter Coleman

REPORTS

REPORT NUMBER: 84:8

TITLE: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SELF-IMPROVEMENT THROUGH SOCIAL CLIMATE ENHANCEMENT

GRANT NUMBER: MG 103

AUTHOR(S): Peter Coleman

PROJECT DIRECTOR:

(if different from author)

PROJECT SITE OR SAMPLE:

This report is based on a study or project funded by the ERIBC Grants Program. This report may be reproduced in whole or in part, but the author(s) and ERIBC must be credited.

ERIBC takes no responsibility for the work as it was carried out, or the conclusions drawn by the author(s).

This report is available on a loan basis (in B.C. only) or a purchase basis at the cost of $17.00 from the

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Suite 701 - 601 West Broadway
Vancouver, B.C. V5Z 4C2
Telephone: (604) 873-3801

# ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SELF-IMPROVEMENT THROUGH SOCIAL CLIMATE ENHANCEMENT

Final Report

Peter Coleman
Administrative Leadership Program
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University

August, 1984

A research project funded by the
Educational Research Institute of British Columbia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the assistance of the Educational Research Institute of B.C. in funding this project, and also for their continuing help and advice during the work. Additionally, I would like to recognise the invaluable help provided by Dr. Linda LaRocque, whose initial Research Assistant role expanded into co-investigator and writer of some of the segments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: Rationale and Objectives.....1

METHODOLOGY: Sample and Design Considerations.....5

METHODOLOGY: Data Collection
Surveys.....9
Observations and Qualitative Data.....16

FINDINGS: Initial Data
Surveys: Factor Analysis.....22
Observations.....27
Qualitative Data.....30
Surveys: School by School Analysis.....32

INTERVENTIONS: Diagnoses and Prescription
Rationale and Process.....38
External Influences.....42

FINDINGS: Final Data
School by School Analysis: Survey Data.....44
School by School Analysis: Interview Data.....48

FINDINGS: Conclusions.....57

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....60

APPENDIX A: Analysis of the Qualitative Data

APPENDIX B: Report to Schools

APPENDIX C: Final Drafts, Parent and Teacher Surveys

## INTRODUCTION: Rationale and Objectives

A consensus is emerging that schools differ in ways which are important to students, and which are reliably associated with student achievement levels. The size of these school effects remains in dispute, although as Centra & Potter (1980) point out, there is good reason to believe that it has been understated. One element which is believed to be an important differentiator between schools is school social climate. Large-scale and methodologically sophisticated studies by Rutter et al. (1979) in Britain with secondary schools, McDill, Rigsby, & Meyers (1977) in the Eastern United States with secondary schools, and Brookover et al. (1979) in Michigan with elementary schools, have all concluded that school social climate differentiates between schools, and predicts some portion of the between-school variance in student achievement levels.

Concurrently, studies of unusually successful schools find that the common element in such schools is the importance of the principal. Shoemaker & Fraser, in a review of several such studies, point out that "Although none of the studies set out to study the role of principals, most concluded that principals were clearly important in determining the effectiveness of schools" (1981:178). Bossert et al. (1982), in an exceptionally thorough review of the literature on unusually effective schools and their principals describe effective schools as having the following characteristics:

1. a school climate conducive to learning -- one free of disciplinary problems and vandalism;
2. a school-wide emphasis on basic skills instruction;
3. the expectation among teachers that all students can achieve; and

4. a system of clear instructional objectives for monitoring and assessing students' performances.

These conditions are created by principals who

5. conceptualize instructional goals, set high academic standards, are informed about problems, visit classrooms, create incentives for learning, maintain student discipline, and generally provide strong programmatic leadership.

They go on to speculate that the creation of a school climate conducive to learning is one of the two major ways in which principals develop unusually effective schools.

Leithwood & Montgomery (1982), examining the role of the elementary school principal, find a substantial body of research which differentiates the behavior of effective principals from ineffective ones. Much of this behavior seems calculated to affect school social climate. Consider the following: Effective principals

"articulated high expectations for teachers as well as for students" (p. 321).

"sell parents on the priority awarded student achievement and enlist their active support" (p. 321).

"seek staff advice on important issues" (p. 326).

"make themselves available as sounding boards for teacher problems" (p. 327).

"monitor student progress closely" (p. 328).

"encourage interactions among teachers about professional issues" (p. 329).

"facilitate communication between the school and the community" (p. 329).

Brookover et al., in their study of elementary school social climate conducive to high student achievement, conducted case studies of unusually successful schools and concluded:

> What the successful schools studied had in common were teachers and principals who believed that their students could achieve at high levels and who accepted the responsibility for seeing that their students' potential for high achievement became a reality (1979:134).

However, Bossert and his colleagues argue that there are many major questions unanswered in the climate research which limit the usefulness of the notion of school climate for researchers and practitioners. These include the following:

> "Is there a school climate separate from classroom climate?
> What are the relevant reference groups for specifying student and teacher climate perceptions?
> How is climate generated, maintained, and changed?" (1982:54).

They also note that studies of school climate have not examined the convergent validity of objective and subjective measures of climate.

Similarly, Anderson's (1982) excellent review of school climate studies identifies some common difficulties, including inadequate study design. Her recommendations on design include the following:

1. use a wide variety of relevant variables, which apply to the student population as a whole;
2. use at least some variables which provide direct measures of the school environment, rather than proxies;
3. focus on variables open to purposeful changes and particularly process variables rather than status variables, i.e., those that involve

"doing" rather than "being" (Note: see Bloom's discussion of "alterable variables" for a full rationale for this emphasis).

4. use outliers, the schools which perform better than the norm, since these exceptions are more enlightening;
5. use in-depth observation, and interviews, because they can provide important supplementary information;
6. use longitudinal designs; and
7. use experiments to assess the effects of interventions.

This study is intended to test the conclusions of previous studies that the behavior of elementary school principals is (a) closely associated with school social climate and (b) is modifiable in ways likely to enhance climate. The study is responsive to some of the questions asked by Bossert and his colleagues, and meets many of the criteria established by Anderson in regard to design. (This responsiveness is the result of converging views rather than explicit reaction, since the study was planned and in progress before the Bossert and Anderson reviews were available).

The formal objectives of the study were:

1. To develop valid and reliable survey measures of school climate in a group of B.C. elementary schools, suitable for use with parents and teachers.
2. To identify the components of general school social climate which are most important to parents and teachers.
3. To identify areas of general school social climate within which teacher and parent perceptions are congruent or dissonant.
4. To measure the strength of the relationship between perceived role of the principal and school climate.

5. To modify the personal role definition of principals involved in the study in ways likely to enhance school climate.
6. To demonstrate that modest changes in the personal role definitions of school principals can measurably improve school climate.

## METHODOLOGY: Sample and Design Considerations

The sample of schools and principals was selected rather arbitrarily: the schools were selected primarily because they had principals and parent and teacher groups who were willing, and even enthusiastic, to participate. It is possible, even likely, as a consequence that they do not represent anything like the full spectrum of elementary schools in the province with regard to climate. In addition, a reasonable degree of diversity was sought in three potentially important status variables: size, rural/urban location, and socio-economic status of the community served. Ten schools were invited to participate, and nine tentatively agreed to do so. After initial meetings with staff and parent representatives, participation was confirmed. Some basic data on the schools and the principals involved is contained in Table 1. (The SES Index No. is calculated by adding mean scores of parents in the school on two survey questions seeking information on household income, and education level of the best educated adult member ofthe household. Maximum possible index score would be 10; minimum would be 0. These two questions discriminated between schools, $p < .001$ in each case.)

The decision to participate was a very serious one for principals, since the task for a participating principal was demanding: first, the principal had to elicit support for the project amongst staff and parents and circulate and maximize returns on the initial surveys of opinion; second, the principal was host to an observation team which spent a day in the school, interviewing

TABLE 1

Basic Data on Schools and Principals

| | SIZE | | LOCATION | | PRINCIPAL | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School ID No. | Enrolment Sept. 18, 1982 | Professional staff (FTE) | Rural, Urban, Metropolitan | Parents* Index No. | Years of Teaching | Years as Principal | Sex and Training Status |
| 8 | 200 | 15 | Rural | 3.6 | 19 | 6 | M; M.Ed. in progress |
| 3 | 105 | 10 | Metro | 6.1 | 17 | 4 | F; M.Ed |
| 14 | 409 | 19 | Urban | 5.1 | 16 | 11 | M; M.Ed. in progress |
| 10 | 121 | 9 | Metro | 4.1 | 18 | 1 | F; M.Ed. in progress |
| 18 | 166 | 9 | Rural | 4.7 | 21 | 10 | M; M.Ed. in progress |
| 2 | 300 | 13 | Rural | 5.1 | 24 | 7 | M; M.Ed. |
| 19 | 79 | 7 | Rural | 4.5 | 18 | 4 | M; M.Ed. |
| 11 | 261 | 14 | Urban | 4.5 | 16 | 6 | M; M.Ed. |
| 5 | 228 | 13 | Metro | 4.8 | 10 | 4 | M; B.Ed. |

* SES Index: Maximum (high income level + high education level) = 10; minimum = 0.

teachers, observing activities, and examining records. Third, the principal had to visit other schools, spending time in observing and reporting. Fourth, the principal was required to participate in a two-day meeting to analyze the data and write a prescription for each school. Fifth, the principal was expected to try to implement the prescription for a school year. Finally, a culminating re-survey and debriefing also requires the principal's participation. (Each of these activities will be described in more detail at the appropriate point in the report.)

The schools in the sample are certainly not representative then; few principals would risk participation unless they anticipated a good showing. The sample may well provide information about school climate and its correlates in good schools (outliers); it is not likely to be revealing about elementary schools in general.

The most basic element in the design was the familiar measure/intervene/measure sequence, in which Stage 1 was an attempt to assess, with some precision, the level of school climate in the participating schools at the beginning of the project, Stage 2 was the diagnosis, prescription, and change efforts stage, and Stage 3 was the final round of data collection, intended to assess the degree of, and reasons for, the success or failure to change the participating schools.

There are three other design elements which are sufficiently unusual to justify description: the criterion variable used as the baseline for convergent validation; the variables chosen for examination; and the use of principals as both observers and subjects.

The criterion variable adopted is the parental assessment of school climate. It was chosen for both sociopolitical and technical reasons. Parental judgments about school climate are important outcome variables in

themselves, in an era when community attitudes toward the public school system are relatively negative (CEA, 1979). Additionally, parental involvement in schools has been identified as an important correlate of both climate and student achievement in elementary schools (Brookover et al., 1979) and secondary schools (McDill, Rigsby & Meyers, 1977). Finally, the large n's allow for a variety of statistical analyses, which provide good measures of validity and reliability.

Additional variables used include a survey of teacher opinion of school climate; a variety of observations in the school focussing on social interactions, student discipline, and "at task" levels in classrooms; a variety of items suggested by previous research, e.g., display of student work in hallways (Brookover et al., 1979); and interviews with a random sample of teachers in each school. As well, some data were collected from school records and from the principal regarding such issues as retention of students in grade, the school testing program, and the principal's work history.

The use of principals as both observers in other schools and as study subjects in their own schools had three rationales. First, it was believed that experienced supervisors might well be reliable and insightful observers, superior to the graduate students normally employed. Second, the principals concerned were enthusiastic about the opportunity to undertake systematic observations in other schools, to add to their own comparative knowledge. Hence this generated support for the project. Third, the culminating activity of Stage 1, in which the school-by-school data are reported back to the principals, is crucial to the success of Stage 2, in which principals attempt to change school climate. The observation round will provide the basis for a collegial atmosphere, and sense of support, which will make the rather painful activity of school assessment more bearable.

## METHODOLOGY: Data Collection

### Surveys

Only the ways in which the procedure here was out of the ordinary are described. The generation of items for the survey was a very much more comprehensive and careful process than is usual. A series of brainstorming sessions was held with principals, with a volunteer group of parents in each school, and with school staffs.

The decision to undertake a round of brainstorming sessions with staff and parents was based on two considerations. First, these key participants in a school would undoubtedly have insights into what elements were important in making up school climate with which to supplement the rather limited array of elements to be gleaned from the literature. Furthermore, their ideas would not be limited by the disciplinary frameworks which seem to have narrowed previous investigations. In addition, the round of sessions involving the project director, teachers, and parents would give an opportunity for discussions of the project, and hence better-informed cooperation. One important anticipated outcome was a greater concern with providing careful answers to the questionnaire, because the genesis of the items was understood. Finally, it was hoped that the sessions would help in achieving high return rates.

The result was a bank of 140 items. Some were clearly only answerable by parents, and some seemed answerable only by teachers. The final surveys had 83 common items, including a school climate rating on a 10-point scale; 11 additional items (including two on socioeconomic status) for parents; and 46 additional items for teachers. The surveys were distributed through the schools; the usable responses from parents totalled 994 of 1404 (71%), and from teachers was 91 of 102 (89%).

These data were then subjected to factor analysis and cross-tabulation. The factor analysis of the parent responses yielded four factors, comprising 41 items, with a minimum factor loading for any item of .380. Together these factors accounted for 77% of the variance in school climate perceived by parents. The factor analysis of the teacher responses on the overall survey yielded no clear factors; however an analysis of teacher responses on the teacher-only items provided two factors, comprising 14 items, with a minimum factor loading of .380, and these factors accounted for 50% of the variance perceived by teachers. The cross-tabulations showed that the vast majority of the items discriminated between schools, and between parent and teacher overall ratings of schools. All these data are summarized in Tables 2-7.

The cross-tabulations further revealed that although the two SES items discriminated between schools very well ($p < .001$) there was no significant relationship between these items and overall rating of school climate. The SES index figure (see Table 1), consequently was not used in subsequent analyses.

Our conclusion is that separate surveys for teachers and parents are necessary in order to provide reliable and valid measures of school climate. That teachers and parents do not share constructs (factors) with regard to school climate is important. Subsequent analyses will suggest that this is only the first of several important inconsistencies. With that proviso, the items listed in Tables 2-7 are considered to provide valid and reliable measures of school climate in B.C. elementary schools, particularly appropriate for fairly good schools.

TABLE 2

Relationship Between Items in Factor A:
Principal Activities and Style and School,
Parent Overall Rating of School Social Climate, and
Teacher Overall Rating of School Social Climate

| Item (Question No.) | | Factor Loading | School p (n=994) | Parent Rating p (n=994) | Teacher Rating p (n=91) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A-1 (22) | The principal is 'open' and approachable. | .699 | .001 | .001 | .05 |
| A-2 (15) | The principal sets a good example for the staff. | .672 | .001 | .001 | .05 |
| A-3 (6) | The principal in our school is very knowledgeable about elementary school programs. | .645 | .001 | .001 | .001 |
| A-4 (13) | The principal spends a lot of time looking for ways to improve our school. | .618 | .001 | .001 | .001 |
| A-5 (56) | The principal in our school treats parent opinions with respect. | .614 | .001 | .001 | .01 |
| A-6 (37) | The principal is available in the school most of the time. | .606 | .001 | .001 | .01 |
| A-7 (33) | The principal freqently talks with students around the school. | .566 | .001 | .001 | .05 |
| A-8 (25) | The principal deals firmly and rapidly with problems in the school | .566 | .001 | .001 | NS |
| A-9 (29) | The principal in our school knows most of the students by name. | .517 | .001 | .001 | NS |
| A-10 (65) | Students in this school respect the principal. | .510 | .001 | .001 | .05 |
| A-11 (21) | The principal provides opportunities for open discussion of problems in the school. | .486 | .01 | .001 | .01 |

TABLE 3

Relationship Between Items in Factor B:
Achievement, Challenge and Motivation and School,
Parent Overall Rating of School Social Climate, and
Teacher Overall Rating of School Social Climate

| Item (Question No.) | | Factor Loading | School p (n=994) | Parent Rating p (n=994) | Teacher Rating p (n=91) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-1 (11) | Students in this school have the necessary motivation to achieve well in basic skills. | .590 | NS | .001 | .001 |
| B-2 (54) | The instructional program in our school helps to motivate students. | .539 | .01 | .001 | .001 |
| B-3 (66) | Students are excited about learning in this school | .480 | .01 | .001 | .001 |
| B-4 (8) | Students in our school have the necessary ability to achieve well in basic skills. | .474 | .001 | .001 | .001 |
| B-5 (14) | The academic emphasis in our school is challenging to students. | .452 | .001 | .001 | .01 |
| B-6 (19) | Our school day is full of challenging activities for students. | .435 | .001 | .001 | .05 |
| B-7 (55) | Students are proud of our school. | .430 | .001 | .001 | .01 |
| B-8 (80) | This school reflects the values of the community in which it is located. | .415 | .05 | .001 | .001 |
| B-9 (38) | Parents in this school set high standards of achievement for their children. | .404 | .001 | .001 | .001 |
| B-10 (77) | Students are good ambassadors for the school. | .403 | .01 | .001 | .001 |
| B-11 (50) | Students at this school learn to work independently. | .377 | NS | .001 | .05 |
| B-12 (51) | Teachers make classes interesting for students in this school. | .375 | .01 | .001 | NS |

TABLE 4

Relationship Between Items in Factor C:
Warm Welcoming Environment and School,
Parent Overall Rating of School Social Climate, and
Teacher Overall Rating of School Social Climate

| Item (Question No.) | | Factor Loading | School p (n=994) | Parent Rating p (n=994) | Teacher Rating p (n=91) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C-1 (89) | Parents are given information in advance of any changes in the school. | .647 | .001 | .001 | -- |
| C-2 (90) | Parents find teachers easily approachable at this school. | .593 | .05 | .001 | -- |
| C-3 (87) | My child(ren) is(are) happy to go to school. | .549 | .05 | .001 | -- |
| C-4 (91) | This school is an important part of the community. | .516 | .05 | .001 | -- |
| C-5 (79) | Students like the teachers in this school. | .419 | NS | .001 | NS |
| C-6 (2) | Our school makes visitors feel welcome. | .406 | .05 | .001 | .001 |
| C-7 (76) | Children feel safe at this school. | .394 | .05 | .001 | .05 |
| C-8 (67) | This school has a comfortable feeling about it. | .382 | .001 | .001 | .01 |

TABLE 5

Relationship Between Items in Factor D:
Social Contract and School,
Parent Overall Rating of School Social Climate, and
Teacher Overall Rating of School Social Climate

| Item (Question No.) | | Factor Loading | School p (n=994) | Parent Rating p (n=994) | Teacher Rating p (n=91) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D-1 (40) | Discipline policies are applied consistently to all children in this school. | .518 | .001 | .001 | .05 |
| D-2 (70) | Teachers in this school feel they are responsible to parents. | .518 | NS | .001 | .001 |
| D-3 (86) | Teachers in our school are consistent in their expectations of students. | .472 | NS | .001 | -- |
| D-4 (71) | Punishment for misbehavior of students is fair in this school. | .470 | .001 | .001 | NS |
| D-5 (62) | Parents are supportive of school discipline policies. | .459 | NS | .001 | .01 |
| D-6 (57) | Students believe that the school respects their opinions. | .455 | NS | .001 | NS |
| D-7 (75) | Parents and teachers respect each other at this school. | .404 | .01 | .001 | .05 |
| D-8 (61) | In this school, information about students is treated as confidential. | .397 | .001 | .001 | NS |
| D-9 (78) | Teachers and parents at this school want the same things for students. | .391 | NS | .001 | .01 |
| D-10 (73) | Students are always the main concern in this school. | .381 | NS | .001 | NS |

TABLE 6

Relationship Between Items in Factor 1:
Teacher-Principal Collegiality and School,
and Teacher Overall Rating of School Social Climate

| Item (Question No.) | | Factor Loading | School p (n=91) | Teacher Rating p (n=91) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-1 (103) | Teachers can participate in decision-making in this school if they wish. | .723 | NS | .05 |
| 1-2 (110) | Staff meetings serve a useful purpose. | .638 | NS | NS |
| 1-3 (87) | Students are grouped in classrooms in a way that helps with instruction. | .619 | .001 | .01 |
| 1-4 (108) | Teachers support school policies on supervision and discipline in our school. | .619 | .05 | .001 |
| 1-5 (93) | The principal in our school keeps interruptions of classroom activities to a minimum. | .542 | .001 | NS |
| 1-6 (98) | Teachers in the school feel free to disagree with the principal in meetings. | .450 | NS | .05 |
| 1-7 (89) | The principal in this school spends a lot of time helping teachers with problems. | .400 | NS | NS |
| 1-8 (107) | Teachers in this school feel free to try out their own ideas. | .385 | NS | NS |

TABLE 7

Relationship Between Items in Factor 2:
Instructional Problem-Solving and School, and
Teacher Overall Rating of School Social Climate

| Item (Question No.) | | Factor Loading | School p (n=91) | Teacher Rating p (n=91) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2-1 (122) | The principal makes opportunities for teachers to plan together in this school. | .808 | NS | .05 |
| 2-2 (100) | The principal encourages teachers to try alternative ways of solving instructional problems. | .677 | NS | .01 |
| 2-3 (95) | Teachers plan the instructional program cooperatively in this school. | .653 | NS | .01 |
| 2-4 (123) | Teaching assignments in this school are as appropriate as possible. | .629 | NS | NS |
| 2-5 (99) | Teachers are usually able to achieve consensus on educational goals and values at this school. | .478 | NS | .05 |
| 2-6 (102) | The principal in this school facilitates the professional development of teachers. | .421 | NS | .05 |

Observations & Qualitative Data

In a recent review of 25 multiple site qualitative research studies, Herriott & Firestone (1983) describe some characteristics of such studies: these typically attempt to integrate qualitative and quantitative data, and are longitudinal studies. Most (20 of 25) employed structured data collection

procedures. The median number of sites studied was 11, with several intermittent visits to each, and both site-specific and cross-site reporting. The observation component in this school climate study paralleled the common pattern which emerges from their review.

There were two or more visits to each site, with most observations resulting from a day-long visit by the observation team. An Observation Manual was used to structure data collection, but observers were encouraged to make personal notes and then to write a global description at the end of the day, based on both structured data collection and personal and unstructured observations. Most of the data from the structured observations were used quantitatively, but the balance, and the global descriptions, were combined with the results of the structured interviews to provide a set of school descriptions of the case study type. However, even these were structured, since the factors emerging from the factor analysis of the parent and teacher surveys were used as organizing categories in writing up the descriptions.

The observation data were subjected to three tests of usability: data were eliminated which (1) failed to distinguish between schools; (2) were not observed in all schools (this unfortunately included some very promising data on staff meetings); and (3) for which interrater reliability levels did not reach at least 67% agreement. The observations, very briefly, were as follows:

1. Principal Interactions - warmth of interactions with various other persons.
2. Student Urgency - student movement in halls en route to classrooms.
3. Teacher Availability - teachers in classrooms with students 10 minutes before and 30 minutes after school.

4. 'At Task' Levels - number of students meeting teacher expectations five minutes after lesson commenced.
5. Classroom Planning - tangible evidence of teacher planning for lesson.
6. Student Recognition - extent to which student achievement was recognized in displays or announcements.
7. Secretary Interactions - warmth of interactions with various other persons.
8. Student/Teacher Interactions - warmth of interactions with various other persons.
9. Student Conduct - behavior in hallways and playgrounds.
10. Interruptions - breaks in lessons by PA or other intrusions.
11. Lunchroom Topics - balance between professional and social topics in conversation.
12. Principal Participation - extent of principal presence during staff lunch.
13. Staff Tone - sense of warmth and collegiality in lunchroom.
14. Test Use - extent to which student performance data are collected and used by the teachers and principal.

The use of three observers allowed three different calculations of percent agreement, and occasionally indicated that one observer was, for a particular observation, quite aberrant. Data from that observer for that observation were eliminated. Most often, however, the data used represent the mean of three observations, on four-point rating scales.

As already suggested, these quantitative data from the observations were validated against the survey data. Table 8 shows correlations between 12 survey scores and various aspects of the schools. The 12 scores were developed by treating parent and teacher survey responses as ratings, and calculating a weighted positive rating for each item in each factor, and then calculating a mean factor score. Factors A-D (Parents) and Climate I, the sum of these, constitute the first five scores. Factors A-D (Teachers) i.e., teacher responses on the common items in the parent factors, make up the second group of four scores. Factors 1 and 2 (Teachers) and Climate II, the sum of 1 and 2, teacher responses on items asked only of teachers, make up the third group.

For convergent validation purposes, Climate I is the key reference point. An examination of Column 11, then, suggests that the four factors making up Climate I are highly interrelated, suggesting both that the original factor analysis was accurate and that Climate I itself is a strong and valid measure of school climate as perceived by parents. The teacher scores, in Rows 5-10, fail to reach significance, but are, with two exceptions, weakly negative in association with Climate I. The school factors which are positively and significantly associated with Climate I are the amount of teaching time of the principal (Row 13), and the number of years the principal has been in the school (Row 15).

The same validation process is used in Table 9. Column 11 shows associations between Climate I and school observations. Few of these are convincing, although those which are (At Task, Student Conduct, and Test Use) are consistent and comprehensible. Column 12 shows associations between Climate II, teacher concerns, and the observation data. As with Table 8, there are some obviously important sign changes, quite consistent with the relationsnips between Teacher Survey data and Parent Survey data, shown in

TABLE 8

Relationships Between Factor Scores and Some School Variables
(Pearson Correlation Coefficients)

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Factor A (P) | 1.00 | .42 | .76* | .73* | -.29 | .14 | -.34 | .32 | -.24 | -.15 | .88* | -.23 |
| 2. Factor B (P) | .42 | 1.00 | .74* | .61* | -.21 | .54* | -.06 | .32 | -.12 | -.30 | .75* | -.24 |
| 3. Factor C (P) | .76* | .74* | 1.00 | .89* | -.13 | .42 | -.23 | .35 | -.25 | -.26 | .95* | -.31 |
| 4. Factor D (P) | .73* | .61* | .89* | 1.00 | -.48* | .03 | -.57* | .13 | -.42 | -.57* | .91* | -.57* |
| 5. Factor A (T) | -.29 | -.21 | -.13 | -.48* | 1.00 | .39 | .61* | .20 | .29 | .69* | -.32 | -.54 |
| 6. Factor B (T) | .14 | .54* | .42 | .03 | .39 | 1.00 | .51* | .36 | .17 | .37 | .30 | .28 |
| 7. Factor C (T) | -.34 | -.06 | -.23 | -.57* | .61* | .51* | 1.00 | .60* | .85* | .67* | -.35 | .87* |
| 8. Factor D (T) | .32 | .32 | .35 | .13 | .20 | .36 | .60* | 1.00 | .62* | .09 | .33 | .43 |
| 9. Factor 1 (T) | -.24 | -.12 | -.25 | -.42 | .29 | .17 | .85* | .62* | 1.00 | .56* | -.29 | .90* |
| 10. Factor 2 (T) | -.15 | -.30 | -.26 | -.57* | .69* | .37 | .67* | .09 | .56* | 1.00 | -.34 | .86* |
| 11. Climate I (Parent A-D) | .88* | .75* | .95* | .91* | -.32 | .30 | -.35 | .33 | -.29 | -.34 | 1.00 | -.37 |
| 12. Climate II (Teacher 1,2) | -.23 | -.24 | -.31 | -.57* | .54* | .28 | .87* | .43 | .90* | .86* | -.37 | 1.00 |
| 13. % Teaching Time of Principal | .51* | .23 | .54* | .81* | -.50* | -.48* | -.80* | -.28 | -.55* | -.54* | .59* | -.62* |
| 14. Years as Principal | .59* | -.10 | .23 | .03 | .19 | .24 | .41 | .57* | .43 | .50* | .28 | .52* |
| 15. Years Principal in the school | .57* | .21 | .73* | .57* | .21 | .26 | .12 | .41 | .10 | .16 | .59* | .14 |
| 16. School Size (Enrolment) | -.01 | -.23 | -.16 | -.38 | .30 | .38 | .80* | .63* | .83* | .59* | -.19 | .81* |

Note: P = Parents; T = Teachers; The column labels correspond to the row labels
* $p$ .1. This level of significance is used because of the small n, and the consequent likelihood of Type I errors.

TABLE 9

Relationships Between Factor Scores & School Observations
(Spearman Rank Order Correlations)

| | FACTORS | | | | | | | | | | CLIMATE | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Observation Variables | A(P) | B(P) | C(P) | D(P) | A(T) | B(T) | C(T) | D(T) | 1(T) | 2(T) | I | II |
| 1. Principal Interactions | .10 | .34 | .34 | .34 | -.14 | .17 | -.78* | -.07 | -.78* | -.78* | .34 | -.78* |
| 2. Student Urgency | .40 | .06 | .42 | .57* | -.29 | .07 | -.41 | .13 | -.35 | -.52 | .36 | -.56* |
| 3. Teacher Availability | .04 | -.42 | .04 | -.33 | .43 | .09 | -.29 | -.65* | -.44 | .16 | -.17 | -.25 |
| 4. 'At Task' Levels | .49* | .31 | .66* | .45 | -.13 | .00 | -.61* | -.13 | -.59* | -.58* | .53* | -.64* |
| 5. Classroom Planning | -.11 | -.28 | .01 | -.24 | .18 | .26 | -.41 | -.61* | -.62* | -.22 | -.24 | -.63* |
| 6. Student Recognition | -.03 | -.11 | -.16 | .09 | -.29 | .16 | .50* | .40 | .49* | .08 | -.03 | .27 |
| 7. Secretary Interactions | .95* | .11 | -.11 | .95* | -.63 | .21 | .10 | .63 | .10 | .21 | .63 | .11 |
| 8. Student/Teacher Inter. | .26 | .51* | .55* | .31 | .40 | .44 | -.30 | -.15 | -.17 | .25 | .32 | -.07 |
| 9. Student Conduct | .65* | .54* | .86* | .44 | .22 | .26 | -.64* | -.26 | -.63* | -.14 | .71* | -.47 |
| 10. Interruptions | -.28 | -.41 | -.52 | -.21 | -.06 | .08 | .58* | .19 | .61 | .50* | -.39 | .52* |
| 11. Lunchroom Topics | -.26 | .03 | -.07 | -.61* | .70* | .21 | .27 | -.29 | .10 | .60* | -.17 | .45 |
| 12. Lunchroom Principal Participation | -.32 | -.46 | -.71* | -.36 | -.19 | -.54* | .47 | .29 | .53 | .27 | -.43 | .61* |
| 13. Lunchroom Staff Tone | .12 | .31 | .48 | -.16 | .64* | .90* | .15 | -.10 | -.18 | .29 | .21 | -.02 |
| 14. Test Use | .63* | -.02 | .40 | .44 | -.11 | .10 | -.06 | .03 | .09 | .30 | .50* | .13 |

* p .1. This level of significance is used because of the small n, and the consequent likelihood of Type I errors.

Table 8. Several of the observation data are associated with Climate II: Student Urgency, At Task, and Classroom Planning, are all strongly and negatively associated with Climate II. The participation of the principal in lunchroom conversation is positively associated as is the number of interruptions. Additionally, and incomprehensibly, the quality of principal interactions is strongly and negatively associated with Climate II.

As with the previous data, the validation of the qualitative data consists of comparing it with the six factors (four parent and two teacher factors) emerging from the validation of the survey data. The data emerging from the taped interviews with a random sample of teachers, and the global impressions of each school recorded by the observers, were sorted into six categories corresponding to the six factors. Both sets of data were examined for similarities and differences among the respondents and observers. The convergence/divergence between the interview data and the global impressions was also examined. With few exceptions, the qualitative data were strongly supportive of the parent ratings.

## FINDINGS: Initial Data

### Surveys: Factor Analysis

The factors emerging from the analysis of the parent survey data are roughly as anticipated. The dominance of the role of the principal was not anticipated, however: this factor alone accounts for 60% of the variance in parents' perceptions of school climate. The items included in Factor A (see Table 2) give a generally coherent picture of the expectations parents have for principals. No major item emerging from the brainstorming is omitted.

The second factor, labelled Achievement, Challenge and Motivation, was much less important than originally anticipated. It accounted for only 7% of

the variance, and a number of items which seemed important did not achieve loadings above the cut-off point. Among these were the following:

(1) High standards for student achievement are set for all students in our school (.330).

(31) Teachers in our school are always looking for ways to improve student achievement levels (.314).

(43) The educational program at our school stresses basic skills in language and mathematics (.321).

The third factor, Warm, Welcoming Environment, also accounted for 7% of the variance, suggesting that parents value this element as much as the academic press of Factor 2. No major items were omitted. The fourth factor, labelled Social Contract, accounted for only 3% of the variance, and included all the items initially thought to be important in this general area.

The analysis of teacher responses yielded one modestly surprising finding: a factor analysis of the responses to both common items and teacher-only items yielded no clear-cut factors. Although the chi square analysis showed that the teacher responses on the common items did discriminate between school ratings, their constructs regarding school climate have nothing in common with those of parents. A factor analysis of the teacher-specific items, on the other hand, revealed two quite clear-cut factors, labelled Teacher-Principal Collegiality and Solving Instructional Problems. These accounted for 50% of the variance.

The comparison of teacher responses and parent responses, and of both with some status variables (see Table 8) also provides some surprises. First, the four parent factors correlate with each other modestly well, as do the two teacher factors, as expected since this merely corroborates the factor analysis. However, teacher responses on the items in Factor A correlate

negatively with parent responses, as do teacher responses on Factor C. Generally these relationships do not reach significance, but column 4 shows that Social Contract (Factor D) is strongly and negatively associated with teacher responses on Factors A and C. Teacher responses are generally positively though weakly correlated with parent responses on the other two factors.

Additionally, the generally close and positive relationship between Factor II and teacher responses on the four parent factors makes it clear that teacher opinions are consistent in contradicting parent opinions.

These results suggest that the classic notion of the principal as "The Man in the Middle" (CEA, 1971) is quite appropriate. If the principal conducts him (her) self so as to maximize parent satisfaction with the social contract aspect of school climate, some negative reaction is likely to be elicited from teachers. Similarly, a school which provides a warm, welcoming climate for students, in the eyes of parents, is less satisfactory for teachers.

This picture of contradictions is supported by the negative relationships between the two teacher factors, Factors 1 and 2, and all four parent factors, and between Climate I and Climate II, respectively the sum of parent factors and of teacher factors. Of these nine negative relationships only one is significant, however. Additionally, the relationships between teacher ratings and parent ratings and two of the status variables differ in sign. The more time the principal spends teaching, the more positively (s)he is perceived by parents and the more negatively by teachers. Similarly, schools size is strongly and significantly associated with climate for teachers, and negatively (although very weakly) for parents.

TABLE 10

Ratings of Schools by Survey Respondents, Scores and Ranking

| Survey Element | Mean Score | School 6 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A (P) | 36.4 | 30.4 8 | 37.4 4 | 33.9 7 | 36.0 6 | 27.9 9 | 36.8 5 | 40.7 3 | 42.7 1 | 41.9 2 |
| Factor B (P) | 30.0 | 26.8 9 | 32.8 3 | 28.2 6 | 32.1 4 | 30.2 5 | 27.9 7 | 33.7 2 | 27.5 8 | 35.3 1 |
| Factor C (P) | 43.2 | 39.0 9 | 42.9 4 | 41.6 8 | 42.5 6 | 42.8 5 | 42.4 7 | 46.6 2 | 44.6 3 | 47.7 1 |
| Factor D (P) | 29.2 | 25.0 9 | 28.5 7 | 29.4 4 | 29.2 6 | 28.5 7 | 29.4 4 | 30.5 3 | 31.3 2 | 36.1 1 |
| Climate I (P) | 34.7 | 30.3 9 | 35.4 4 | 33.3 7 | 35.0 5 | 32.4 8 | 34.1 6 | 37.9 2 | 36.5 3 | 40.2 1 |
| Factor 1 (T) | 42.1 | 46.2 2 | 35.2 9 | 44.6 3 | 43.4 4 | 38.4 5 | 36.7 7 | 48.7 1 | 36.9 6 | 35.4 8 |
| Factor 2 (T) | 40.2 | 44.9 2 | 41.3 3 | 39.5 5 | 34.7 8 | 38.9 6 | 35.5 7 | 45.6 1 | 41.3 3 | 32.4 9 |
| Climate II (T) | 41.2 | 45.5 2 | 38.3 7 | 42.1 3 | 39.0 5 | 38.6 6 | 36.1 8 | 47.2 1 | 39.1 4 | 33.9 9 |

Note: The first number shown in each cell is the school score, which has a maximum of 67.0; the second number is the school rank, with 1 being high and 9 being very low.

When school ratings based on the surveys are compared (Table 10), the picture seems even more contradictory: the school (No. 19) which is most positively perceived by parents (ranked 1 on Climate I) is least positively perceived by teachers (ranked 9 on Climate II). Similarly, school No. 2 is lowest ranked by parents, and ranked second by teachers (9 on Climate I, 2 on Climate II). However, in general Climate I and Climate II are not reciprocals. The qualitative data, to be discussed later, provide some tentative explanations for these contradictions.

In essence, these survey results suggest that school climate preferences are different for parents and teachers, and that on the items important to parents, teachers are likely to have contrary opinions. Although the overall negative relationship, summarized in the -.37 correlation between Climate I and Climate II does not reach significance at the level chosen, the prevalence of negative relationships between teacher and parent response patterns is clear enough. The report one gets on the climate of an elementary school depends upon whom you ask.

Further, parent preferences for school climate are not summed up in the notion of academic press, as one might conclude from reading U.S. research in such reviews as Shoemaker & Fraser (1981). British Columbia parents take a more balanced view, with warmth being as important a quality of elementary school climate as achievement orientation, and the principal being expected to balance these elements in his (her) own behavior as well: (s)he is expected to be 'open and approachable', 'knowledgeable about ... programs', look for 'ways to improve the schoool', 'deal with problems' and 'know most of the students by name'.

It is not surprising that Anderson summarizes the view of some scholars by describing school climate as a Unicorn: "a mythological beast to be hoped for and dreamt about but one which can never be found" (1982, p. 371).

Observations

The observation data, correlated with the survey data in Table 9 and summarized by school in Table 11, are not convincing. Most of the associations are weak, and do not attain even the modest level of significance selected as appropriate. This is probably attributable to the fact that these schools were not very different, in the perceptions of observers, that the high-inference ratings (of interactions, for example) were difficult to make resulting in only small differences in scores, and that some of the more revealing data were unusable because they were incomplete.

Nevertheless, some interesting associations do emerge (see Table 9). The student observations are the most clear cut. 'Student Urgency' correlates positively but weakly with Climate I, significantly with Factor D, and negatively and significantly with teacher perceptions. Student 'At Task' levels correlate positively with Climate I, but not Factor B, and negatively with teacher perceptions. 'Student Conduct' is strongly correlated with parent perceptions and almost as strongly but negatively correlated with teacher perceptions.

The observations concerned with interactions also yield some interesting associations: the positive relationships between 'Secretary Interactions' and between 'Student-Teacher Interactions' and some of the parent perceptions are consistent with expectations. However, the strongly negative relationship between Principal Interactions and teacher perceptions is inexplicable.

The observations concerned with instruction, 'Teacher Availability', 'Classroom Planning', 'Interruptions', and 'Test Use' offer few significant associations. The largely negative relationships of the first two with teacher perceptions are inconsistent with expectations, but consistent with the negative relationships already noted between teacher perceptions and

student 'At Task', 'Urgency', and 'Conduct' observations. 'Interruptions' are viewed positively by teachers, negatively by parents; for teachers, they are quite closely associated with both warm environment and instructional planning, which is comprehensible.

The observations focussing on teachers at lunchtime provide a few very interesting associations. The prevalence of professional topics associates with teacher perceptions on instructional planning; oddly, positive staff tone associates strongly with the teachers' perceptions on parent Factors A and B, but not with teacher perceptions on teacher Factors 1 and 2. The principal's participation in the lunchroom talk is naturally enough associated (though not strongly) with teachers' Factor 1, but is negatively associated wih all the parent perceptions.

A summary of this rather confusing set of associations can only be tentative. The lack of congruence between parent and teacher preferences and expectations is again evident. In particular, parents seem to prefer a business-like, task-oriented atmosphere. Teachers prefer a more relaxed atmosphere. Amongst the significant associations, the negative relationships between Climate II and Student Urgency and At Task levels, and the positive relationships between Climate I and 'At Task' and 'Student Conduct' illustrate these contrasts. Also, for example, parents regard interruptions as negative, but teachers regard them as important to school activities. (It seems likely that there is a threshold here: beyond a particular level teachers might well find interruptions distracting, but in the schools visited interruptions were rare, timed so as to be nonintrusive (at the dismissal bell in most cases), and not trivial in content.)

TABLE 11

Ratings of Schools By Observers

| Variable | Mean Score | School 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 14 | 18 | 19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal Interactions | 2.9 | 2.5 | 3.0 | ND* | ND* | 3 | 3 | 2.9 | ND* | 3.0 |
| Student Urgency | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 3.0 |
| 'At Task' Levels** | 2.3 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.8 |
| Classroom Planning | 69% | 63% | 83% | 50% | 57% | 87% | 86% | 50% | 83% | 63% |
| Student Recognition | 2.7 | 4.0 | 0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| Secretary Interaction | 2.8 | ND* | ND* | ND* | 2.6 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | ND* | ND* |
| Student/ Teacher Inter. | 2.8 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | ND* | 3.0 |
| Student Conduct** | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Interruptions | 1.3 | 4.0 | 0 | 2.0 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lunchroom Staff Tone | 2.7 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 | ND* | 2.5 |
| Test Use** | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 |

* ND = No Date
** Significantly and positively associated with Climate I

Qualitative Data

Data from the interviews and global impressions were condensed to form a five or six page report on each school. Several features of these qualitative data deserve comment:

1. Both types of qualitative data are highly consistent. The global impressions provided by the three observers in each school are not discrepant, nor are the accounts provided by the interviewed teachers. The consistency of these data attests to their reliability.

2. There is good agreement between the two types of qualitative data. For example, compare the two descriptions of staff relations in School #10, the first of which is based on interview data and the second, on the global impressions:

> "The respondents were most emphatic about how very cohesive and close the staff was. According to one, 'It makes this a special place to work, compensates for the difficulties of the job.' They said this is enhanced by the fact that some of the teachers are friends outside of school, but mainly by the fact that they share a common educational philosophy."

> "The observers commented that this was a harmonious staff who obviously shared a common philosophy and set of classroom routines."

Or compare the descriptions of the academic press of School #5. The summary of the interview data begins:

> "There seems to be some real cause for concern about the academic press of the school -- teacher expectations, teacher attitude to testing, to homework, and to awards, all suggest a low academic press.

This is supported by the global impressions:

> "The observers were rather critical of the academic press of the school, giving the following as reasons: (a) the lack of evidence of challenge or excitement -- adjectives such as "listless", "dull", "no

drive", "unexciting", "tired", "passive", were used by all the observers; (b) the routine nature of the teaching activities, which involved much seatwork and use of workbooks, with no individualized or group work evident; (c) the just-on-time or late arrival of teachers for class; (d) the lack of evidence of planning; and (e) the attitude of a couple of teachers in particular 'who seemed to regard teaching as a secondary occupation'."

3. The qualitative data are supportive of the parent survey data, which have been chosen as the reference point for convergent validation. For example, the parent rating of Factor A: Principal Activities and Style, is highest for School #5. Both the interview data and the global impressions are also very positive, and provide some explanation for the high parent ratings:

"According to the respondents, the relationship between home and school had not been particularly good in the past. This principal, however, believes such relationships are very important, vital in fact, and has worked very hard to make parents feel at ease about coming into the school and discussing their concerns with the professionals. The results of his efforts are becoming evident this year, in terms of increased parental support and involvement.

One of the ways by which the principal has attempted to make the parent feel welcome in and a part of the school is morning meetings. Each week he invites 10 or so parents to meet with him at the school. He takes them on a tour of the school, including visits to their children's classrooms to observe what is happening there, and returns to the library to discuss their concerns with them informally over coffee. Another benefit of these meetings is that the principal has an opportunity to get to know all the parents on an individual basis.

The fact that the principal knows all the students also contributes

to the good rapport he has established with the parents. They are reassured to discover that the principal knows who their child is and how he/she is doing.

The observers described the principal as organized, well-informed about the school and the community, and a significant influence on the operation of the school."

4. The qualitative data are able to offer explanations for the survey data. For example, consider School #3. Parent ratings are consistently low, suggesting a broadly-based disenchantment amongst parents with no specific focus. Teacher ratings, however, are high, and the qualitative data are generally positive. The frequent references in the interview data to the restraint issue and the tensions between the school and the community which have arisen because of it may account for the apparent nonspecific parent disenchantment.

Conversely, the parent ratings of School #7 are uniformly high, and the qualitative data are generally positive. The teacher ratings, however, are low; the qualitative data suggest that the problem lies in the absence of cooperative and collegial planning for instruction -- the teachers function autonomously rather than as part of a school staff with a common purpose.

The qualitative data present a cohesive and distinctive image of each school, one which supports and illuminates the picture which emerges from the survey data. That the participating principals are able to recognize their own school and those they observed from the reports based on the qualitative data attests to their validity.

Surveys: School by School Analysis

The first analysis of the survey data, using factor analysis, ignored the problem of the unit of analysis, which is currently believed to be an

important source of error in survey research. Briefly, it is currently asserted that when respondents are asked to give an opinion on a particular reality, such as a school, the data resulting cannot readily be considered to apply to other similar institutions, unless care is taken to elicit opinions specifically intended to apply generally to all schools. Since the parent and teacher respondents here were specifically asked to respond with respect to a particular school, an analysis which groups all responses for such purposes as factor analysis is inappropriate. However, the size of the school by school respondent pool did not allow school by school factor analysis. An alternative form of analysis was used to attempt to identify those items which clustered into scales.

In preparation for this, with the parent surveys, the pool of responses was reduced by eliminating all those respondents who failed to answer 20% or more of the questions, on the grounds that such respondents probably did not have sufficient knowledge of the school to respond accurately to the questions on school climate. A pool of 809 respondents remained, of the original 994.

The second step was to eliminate all items which 20% of the remaining respondents failed to answer, on the grounds that if a substantial proportion of these apparently well-informed respondents could not respond, the question was simply too difficult. The third step was to fill any remaining non-responses with school mean responses for the item. The set of questions and responses remaining were considered to represent a broad-ranging bank of items to which parents felt able to respond comfortably, and on which they apparently had reasonably reliable information.

This bank of items was then sorted into conceptual categories, based on the initial expectations of the project, and drawn from the literature. The four categories, or scales, emerging were:

PA - Principal Activities

AP - Academic Press

WWE - Warm Welcoming Environment

SC - Social Contract

These are, of course, the same factors emerging from the factor analysis of the aggregated data. In order to test the validity and reliability of these scales a backwards multiple regression analysis was conducted, by school. The overall parent rating of the school, the original item 92, was used as the criterion variable. Items which did not appear in the regression equations of at least half of the schools were eliminated. The distribution of the remaining 51 items is shown in Table 12 below.

TABLE 12

Categories Emerging from Parent Surveys, School by School Analysis

---

Academic Press

(Questions 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33, 37, 41, 45, 48, 51).

Principal Activities

(Questions 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30, 34, 38, 42)

Warm Welcoming Environment

(Questions 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31, 35, 39, 43, 46, 49)

Social Contract (Discipline and Community Relations)

(Questions 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36, 40, 44, 47, 50)

---

School scores for each of these item groupings were calculated, by totalling all the responses for each set of items by school, and dividing by the number of respondents. These category scores were summed to provide an overall school climate score. Table 13 shows school by school scores by category, with the rank ordering of the school for that category. When these rank orderings are compared with those from the aggregated factor analysis, using parallel categories (see Table 10), it can be seen that the rank orderings vary very little. In only 20% of the comparisons did the rank order change by more than two places.

The relationship between these school scores on the four categories and the overall ratings of these schools assigned by parents were then calculated, using multiple regressions. The school scores on each of the categories correlated strongly with the overall ratings; however they also correlated strongly with each other, suggesting that these categories are not discrete scales, but joint measures of a global concept. The fact that school climate can be measured almost equally well with such conceptually different categories suggests an explanation for the difficulties encountered by previous research and noted in Anderson (1982): it may be that school climate is intrinsically a vague notion which survey respondents cannot readily define, and hence they are quite suggestible, readily accepting definitions provided by researchers in surveys, and being unable to distinguish between categories such as Principal Activities and Warm Welcoming Environment, as correlates of school climate.

The teacher surveys, for the school by school analysis, were treated in similar ways to the parent surveys, except that the very small numbers of respondents did not allow the use of multiple regression analyses. Instead,

TABLE 13

School Scores (Rank Order) on Parent and Teacher Surveys

| Survey | Item Category | School 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parent | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Principal Activities | 36.1 (6) | 36.9 (3) | 38.1 (1) | 35.8 (8) | 38.0 (2) | 35.4 (9) | 36.6 (5) | 36.9 (3) | 36.0 (7) |
| | Academic Press | 42.9 (8) | 44.4 (3) | 44.8 (1) | 43.4 (6) | 44.4 (3) | 43.4 (6) | 44.7 (2) | 43.5 (5) | 42.4 (9) |
| | Warm, Welcoming Environment | 40.9 (9) | 42.8 (3) | 43.4 (1) | 41.1 (7) | 41.8 (4) | 41.2 (6) | 43.1 (2) | 41.7 (5) | 41.0 (8) |
| | Social Contract | 40.9 (5) | 40.9 (5) | 42.0 (2) | 40.9 (5) | 41.8 (3) | 39.2 (9) | 42.4 (1) | 41.0 (4) | 40.7 (8) |
| | CLIMATE | 160.9 (7) | 164.9 (4) | 168.3 (1) | 161.2 (6) | 165.9 (3) | 159.2 (9) | 166.8 (2) | 163.1 (5) | 160.1 (8) |
| Teacher | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Principal Activities | 30.3 (7) | 31.0 (5) | 33.3 (1) | 31.4 (3) | 31.3 (4) | 31.8 (2) | 27.8 (9) | 29.8 (8) | 30.4 (6) |
| | Academic Press | 30.3 (7) | 31.4 (4) | 34.0 (1) | 32.0 (2) | 29.7 (8) | 31.7 (3) | 30.8 (6) | 31.2 (5) | 28.2 (9) |
| | School Environment | 30.3 (2) | 30.2 (3) | 31.9 (1) | 29.6 (5) | 29.0 (9) | 29.2 (7) | 29.5 (6) | 30.2 (3) | 29.2 (7) |
| | Social Contract | 50.8 (2) | 47.7 (6) | 53.9 (1) | 47.6 (5) | 48.7 (3) | 46.6 (9) | 47.5 (6) | 47.2 (8) | 47.9 (4) |
| | Teacher Efforts | 23.0 (5) | 23.4 (2) | 24.3 (1) | 22.4 (6) | 22.4 (6) | 23.4 (2) | 20.8 (9) | 23.1 (4) | 21.2 (8) |
| | CLIMATE | 164.4 (2) | 163.7 (3) | 177.4 (1) | 163.0 (4) | 161.1 (7) | 162.7 (5) | 156.4 (9) | 161.5 (6) | 156.9 (8) |

for the five conceptual categories emerging from the reduced bank of items, alpha coefficients for the five largest schools were calculated. After a series of eliminations, a set of 50 items remained, in the categories shown in Table 14. Alpha coefficients for these scales ranged from .63 to .88; half exceeded .80, and only three fell below .70.

TABLE 14

Categories from Teacher Surveys, School by School Analysis

---

Principal Activities
(Questions 6, 25, 37, 83, 96, 100, 104, 118, 121)

Academic Press
(Questions 1, 8, 19, 35, 38, 46, 53, 54, 66, 90)

School Environment
(Questions 2, 49, 55, 64, 68, 76, 79, 114)

Social Contract
(Questions 3, 9, 20, 26, 30, 32, 40, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 78, 80, 108)

Teacher Effort
(Questions 39, 48, 84, 88, 101, 115, 119)

---

Although these categories appear to overlap very considerably with the parent categories, they do not contain the same items. Once these categories had been established for the larger schools, they were assumed to apply also to the smaller schools, and teacher scores were developed for each category and each school. The results are shown in the lower portion of Table 13.

## INTERVENTIONS: Diagnoses and Prescriptions

### Rationale and Process

The basic assumption underlying the interventions, already described and explained above, was that the school principal is the critical change agent, particularly with respect to school climate. This assumption was, of course, strongly supported by the factor analysis of the initial data and particularly the parent attitude data. Four additional elements of the rationale have not yet been described: the role of feedback in change efforts; the focus on the school as unit; the roles as team members of the participating principals; and the concern with staff development. Each of these issues can be dealt with very briefly.

Many change efforts have relied on the feedback of status information as one means of encouraging change. For example, teacher development activities typically rely on feedback of data from classroom observations as a mainstay in change efforts (see, e.g., McNergney and Carrier, 1981). Similarly, Fullan's (1982) major work on change focusses on the problem of meaning, including shared perceptions of status and desired futures. Feedback systems are integral to this notion of change. Goodlad's recent major study, A Place Called School, similarly focusses on the problem of data. Discussing school improvement, he comments: "what comes through clearly ... is the need for school-by-school agendas based on hard data" (1984, p. 175). That perception is as basic to the rationale for this research project as the view that the principal is the critical change agent.

Goodlad's emphasis on school-by-school agendas is also a fundamental part of the rationale for this project. The importance of the school as a focus

for change efforts has been argued at length by Goodlad (1983) and in essence emerges from research on unusually effective schools which finds very significant differences in quality between schools, even within a group of schools serving the same community and with equivalent resources (see, e.g., Rutter, 1979). Although Goodlad believes that the utility for such an approach cannot yet be demonstrated, evidence from other kinds of research supports it. For example, Weick's (1976) well-known article on 'loose coupling' suggests that educational organizations are characteristically and necessarily non-bureaucratic, in the sense that mandates from upper levels in the hierarchy are unreliably influential. (See also Mintzberg, 1979, on the professional bureaucracy, and Lipsky, 1978, on policy implementation.)

The in-school conditions necessary for school success have been identified at least speculatively by Little. She finds that the school as a setting is extremely powerful. In particular, group norms are very important:

> Some schools sustain shared expectations (norms) both for extensive collegial work and for analysis and evaluation of an experimentation with their practices; continuous improvement is a shared undertaking in these schools, and these schools are the most adaptable and successful of the schools we studied (1982, p. 338).

The same link between adaptability and success is identified by Goodlad in A Study of Schooling (1983a). A policy implementation study in a Canadian school district found that Little's norm of collegiality and norm of continuous improvement characterized a school which was unusually successful in implementing district and provincial policies (LaRocque, 1983).

The use of the principals in the project as members of the research team had two major components: first, they functioned as observers for the purpose of data collection; second, they functioned as analysts and advisers at the intervention stage. After the initial data had been analyzed, they were provided to the principals in a workshop setting. Two teams were formed, and each team reviewed data on some of the schools. No principal reviewed the data on his own school. Then a series of recommendations, based on the data, were made to the school. A chart summarizing recent research on the characteristics of effective schools and effective principals was provided to assist in developing these (see Appendix B). Two advantages derived from this process: principals were well aware of the source and the kind of consideration given to the recommendations for change they received. Also, their participation in the process increased their own understanding of the data on their own school, the possibilities which exist, and the range of quality. Both these features were expected to be helpful to them.

The final issue is the concern with staff development and collegiality, which arose out of the factor analysis of the data, and particularly the teacher attitude data, summarized as Climate II. This too is thoroughly supported by recent research. It is vital that the principal and staff share a concern for the school as a whole: in Goodlad's study successful schools had "staff members who decided to take care of the school's business" (1983a, p. 555). Similarly, LaRocque (1983) distinguished between school-regarding and classroom-regarding teachers. One of the main tasks of a principal wishing to improve a school seems to be the creation of a school-regarding ethos, in which joint responsibility is vital. (See, e.g., Rutter et al., 1979, p. 193, for the relationship between school quality and staff harmony.) The results of the Rand "Change Agent Study" support both the

institutional leadership of the principal and good working relationships amongst teachers as critical elements in successful implementation of change (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1979).

The project data support these emphases quite strongly: major items from Climate II include

> "Teachers can participate in decision-making in this school if they wish"; Staff meetings serve a useful purpose"; "The principal makes opportunities for teachers to plan together in this school"; "The principal encourages teachers to try alternative ways of solving instructional problems"; and "Teachers plan the instructional program cooperatively in this school."

The nature of the recommendations made to the paticipating schools varied a good deal depending on the initial status of the school. Every effort was made to tie together the diagnosis and prescription elements; in the review process, each team reviewed the data on a school very thoroughly before attempting to develop a prescription. After the workshop, the recommendations for each school were forwarded by mail, in a standardized format. The expectation was that the receiving principal would discuss these with the staff of the school (considered essential because of the concern with collegiality), and that the group would develop a plan for implementation of the recommendations. It was assumed that the strong data base, the careful consideration given these recommendations by the research team, and the active participation of the school principal in the process (although not of course in the development of the specific set of recommendations) would ensure that the staff would find the advice given persuasive and of high priority, particularly in the schools which were not seen to have a particularly good

climate. The analysis of the final round of data, and particularly the final set of interviews, will show how realistic these expectations were.

External Influences

Given the extent to which schools seem to be impervious to outside influences attempting to change school policies and practices (see, for example, McLaughlin and Marsh, 1982; Fullan, 1979) no consideration was given by the researcher to the possibility that external influences might have a widespread impact on school climate during the term of the study. However, a major policy initiative of the provincial government, the "restraint program", which was both extremely controversial in purposes, and exigent in application, proved to have a very considerable impact on the public schools.

The restraint program was initially announced in February, 1982, and during the following months a series of legislative and policy announcements followed in rapid succession, aimed at controlling or even reducing public sector expenditures. For example, the Education (Interim) Finance Act gave the government direct control over school district budgets and eliminated the taxing powers of school boards. The Compensation Stabilization Program established guidelines for salaries for all public sector employees, and effectively eliminated collective bargaining in the public sector. School district budget increases were sharply limited for the 1982-1983 school year, resulting in a substantial number of teacher layoffs.

The snap election of May 5, 1983, called on the issue of restraint, resulted in an increased majority for the government, and with this mandate even more severe policies were announced, including even tighter control over educational spending. In July, 1983, a series of measures were introduced into the Legislature which proposed reductions of government services of various kinds, including public and post-secondary educational services. An

opposition group, the Solidarity Coalition, was formed under the auspices of the British Columbia Federation of Labour. Private and public sector unions were leading members of the Coalition. In August, the British Columbia Teacher's Federation joined the Coalition.

During the summer and early fall the Federation planned for an unprecedented strike; a vote was conducted by district associations in October, and the result announced was a 60% majority for strike, if it was felt necessary by the Executive. Effectively this decision was taken by the Solidarity Coalition, which decided upon a strategy of escalating job action, in which the education sector would join on November 8, 1983. The Federation Executive endorsed this plan. A number of attempts to head off the strike plan were made by school districts, and by the Ministry, and some injunctions were issued. However, the strike proceeded as planned, with very substantial participation by teachers: the CBC assessed participation at 83% (Hutchison, 1984); the Vancouver Sun survey of many districts did not attempt a count but suggested that virtually all schools in the province were picketed, and the vast majority did not operate, although principals were in most schools (Vancouver Sun, Nov. 8, 1983).

During the week, teacher support for the strike strengthened, and by Friday, November 11 (a school holiday) it was clear that the strike was overwhelmingly successful, although apparently illegal, since the Labor Relations Board was issuing injunctions quite freely to school districts (The Province, Nov. 13, 1983). A Federation account suggests that "buoyant spirits and camaraderie marked the picket line" (Hutchison, 1984); however the newspapers reported some hostility from parents whose children were not admitted to schools. The Globe and Mail report on a sample school included as subhead "Principal of school is reviled by both sides as strike grows" (Globe and Mail, Nov. 11, 1983). Newspaper editorials were generally hostile to the

strike: The Province for example argued that the strike was a political protest, that the government clearly was supported by the majority of the province's population, and that to use "children as pawns in this political protest destroys any claim the striking teachers can make to professionalism" (The Province, November 8, 1983). Similar sentiments were expressed in other newspapers, and by columnists, even those generally hostile to the government. The status of general public opinion was not clear.

These unprecedented events clearly can be expected to have some impact on parent perception of school climate in the schools in the study. However, the strength of this impact will very likely differ from school to school, as a consequence of local circumstances and events at each individual school. A brief discussion of these will be provided in the final section, based on interviews with the principals. Unfortunately it is extremely difficult to disentangle the effects of the interventions and other events from those of the teacher strike, and the relative weight of school-level and provincial events is difficult to estimate. The issue will be discussed further in the concluding section.

## FINDINGS: Final Data

### School by School Analysis: Survey Data

Given the emphasis on individualized prescriptions for change, the final surveys of parent and teacher opinion made use of the survey form used in the school by school analysis reported above. Follow-up interviews were conducted with the principals, and with the same sample of teachers originally interviewed (with one or two unavoidable exceptions due to staff changes).

The new survey data, in the form of scale scores, are shown in Tables 15 and 16. The tables also incorporate the scale scores from the previous surveys, and show differences, in positive and negative directions.

TABLE 15

Changes in Parent Attitudes Regarding School Climate, by School

| SCALES | | SCHOOLS | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Scores | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Principal | 1982 | 36.1 | 36.9 | 38.1 | 35.8 | 38.0 | 35.4 | 36.6 | 36.9 | 36.0 |
| Activities | 1984 | 36.2 | 35.6 | 38.8 | 37.1 | 38.4 | 36.9 | 38.0 | 36.6 | 36.6 |
| | Diff. | +0.1 | -1.3 | +0.7 | +1.3 | +0.4 | +1.5 | +1.4 | -0.3 | +0.6 |
| Academic | 1982 | 42.9 | 44.4 | 44.8 | 43.4 | 44.4 | 43.4 | 44.7 | 43.5 | 42.4 |
| Press | 1984 | 43.6 | 44.7 | 45.6 | 44.8 | 44.9 | 43.6 | 47.1 | 43.9 | 43.7 |
| | Diff. | +0.7 | +0.3 | +0.8 | +1.4 | +0.5 | +0.2 | +2.4* | +0.4 | +1.3 |
| Warm | 1982 | 40.9 | 42.8 | 43.4 | 41.1 | 41.8 | 41.2 | 43.1 | 41.7 | 41.0 |
| Welcoming | 1984 | 40.9 | 41.7 | 43.7 | 43.1 | 42.6 | 41.6 | 44.2 | 41.4 | 42.2 |
| Environment | Diff. | 0.0 | -1.1 | +0.3 | +2.0 | +0.8 | +0.4 | +1.1 | -0.3 | +1.2 |
| Social | 1982 | 40.9 | 40.9 | 42.0 | 40.9 | 41.8 | 39.2 | 42.4 | 41.0 | 40.7 |
| Contract | 1984 | 40.4 | 40.9 | 42.1 | 42.6 | 42.1 | 39.8 | 44.1 | 41.0 | 41.3 |
| | Diff. | -0.5 | 0.0 | +0.1 | +1.7 | +0.3 | +0.6 | +1.7 | 0.0 | +0.6 |
| CLIMATE | 1982 | 160.9 | 164.9 | 168.3 | 161.2 | 165.9 | 159.2 | 166.8 | 163.1 | 160.1 |
| | 1984 | 161.1 | 162.9 | 170.2 | 167.6 | 168.0 | 161.9 | 173.4 | 162.9 | 163.8 |
| | Diff. | +0.2 | -2.0 | +1.9 | +6.4 | +2.1 | +2.7 | +6.6 | -0.2 | +3.7 |
| | Ranks | 7/9 | 4/7 | 1/2 | 6/4 | 3/3 | 9/8 | 2/1 | 5/7 | 8/5 |

* Difference = or > 5% of original score.

TABLE 16

Changes in Teacher Attitudes Regarding School Climate, by School

| SCALES | | SCHOOLS | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Scores | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Principal | 1982 | 30.3 | 31.0 | 33.3 | 31.4 | 31.3 | 31.8 | 27.8 | 29.8 | 30.4 |
| Activities | 1984 | 27.9 | 30.2 | 30.0 | 29.5 | 29.8 | 28.3 | 27.8 | 27.4 | 27.0 |
| | Diff. | -2.1 | -0.8 | -3.3* | -1.9 | -1.5 | -3.5* | 0.0 | -2.4 | -3.4* |
| Academic | 1982 | 30.3 | 31.4 | 34.0 | 32.0 | 29.7 | 31.7 | 30.8 | 31.2 | 28.2 |
| Press | 1984 | 30.3 | 35.5 | 33.5 | 31.1 | 30.7 | 32.1 | 33.5 | 29.9 | 29.6 |
| | Diff. | 0.0 | +4.1* | -0.5 | -0.9 | +1.0 | +0.4 | +2.1 | -1.3 | +1.4 |
| School | 1982 | 30.3 | 30.2 | 31.9 | 29.6 | 29.0 | 29.2 | 29.5 | 30.2 | 29.2 |
| Environment | 1984 | 29.2 | 32.7 | 31.4 | 30.0 | 30.1 | 28.8 | 31.8 | 29.1 | 28.2 |
| | Diff. | -1.1 | +2.5 | -0.5 | +0.4 | +1.1 | -0.4 | +2.3 | -1.1 | -1.0 |
| Social | 1982 | 50.8 | 47.7 | 53.9 | 47.6 | 48.7 | 46.6 | 47.5 | 47.2 | 47.9 |
| Contract | 1984 | 49.7 | 52.5 | 51.5 | 47.5 | 50.0 | 46.3 | 51.5 | 44.1 | 45.0 |
| | Diff. | -1.1 | +4.8* | -2.4 | -0.1 | +1.3 | -0.2 | +4.0 | -3.1 | -2.9 |
| Teacher | 1982 | 23.0 | 23.4 | 24.3 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 23.4 | 20.8 | 23.1 | 21.2 |
| Effort | 1984 | 21.1 | 24.7 | 23.5 | 21.6 | 22.7 | 22.8 | 21.8 | 21.7 | 20.2 |
| | Diff. | -1.9 | +1.3 | -0.8 | -0.8 | +0.3 | -0.6 | +1.0 | -1.4 | -1.0 |
| CLIMATE | 1982 | 164.4 | 163.7 | 177.4 | 163.0 | 161.1 | 162.7 | 156.4 | 161.5 | 156.9 |
| | 1984 | 158.2 | 175.6 | 169.9 | 159.7 | 163.3 | 158.3 | 166.4 | 152.2 | 150.0 |
| | Diff. | -6.2 | +11.9 | -7.5 | -3.3 | +2.2 | -4.4 | +10.0 | -9.3 | -6.9 |
| | Ranks | 2/7 | 3/1 | 1/2 | 4/6 | 7/4 | 5/5 | 9/3 | 6/8 | 8/9 |

*Difference = or > 10% of original score

Since the size of the sample does not allow any of the normal tests of statistical significance to be used, a decision rule approach has been adopted. Should a scale score change by 5% of the original score for the parent data, and 10% for teachers (because of the small sample), the shift will be considered meaningful. A lesser level of importance may be attached to a consistent trend, in which all or most of the scale scores for a particular school move in the same direction, or to a slight shift in rank order of a particular school. All such shifts require some interpretation, by reference both to the prescriptions for change developed for the school, and the final interview data concerning events at the school during the period between the first and second pairs of surveys. Additionally, shifts in a consistent direction which seem to affect all or most schools may require interpretation with reference to external influences.

Focussing first on the parent data, schools 4, 6, and 7 have experienced a positive shift in parental perception of the activities of the principal. However, these shifts are not quite strong enough to be meaningful. School 7 has also experienced a positive shift in parent perception of academic press. Schools 4 and 7 have both experienced a very consistent pattern of shifts, in which every scale score has moved positively, most not quite strongly enough to be considered meaningful. The pattern seems important, however.

A similar observation can be made with regard to the overall measure of climate: with a single exception, all of the schools are slightly more positively perceived by parents now than in the original survey. Given the general provincial climate at the present time, described above (External Influences), this finding might well be viewed as very encouraging: one might argue that participation in the project had positive effects on parental

opinion which outweighed the more general influences. Further with regard to overall climate, most of the schools have retained the approximate rank ordering they had originally, although schools 8 and 9 seem to have changed places.

Turning to the teacher data, one finds that schools 3, 6, and 9 have all experienced meaningful negative shifts in teacher perceptions of the principal's activities; however these are certainly a part of a major negative shift affecting all the schools, and are probably associated with the difficult situation of principals during the strike (see External Influences). Given this general influence, and the fairly consistent negative shift in six of the nine schools, school 2's strong and consistently positive shifts in staff perceptions of climate are quite striking, as are the consistently positive shifts in schools 5 and 7.

School by School Analysis: Interview Data

The primary use of the interview data is to provide means of interpreting the survey data. In this section, the results of the interviews will be reported very briefly, and then links between the survey and interview data will be sought.

School 1. The principal believes that the school survived the strike well, as regards parent reaction, but less well as regards teacher reaction. The staff was split on the strike, and two teachers did in fact work throughout it. Tension between these and other teachers was high after the staff returned to work. Parents, on the other hand, were sympathetic. A substantial number attended a meeting called by the principal to discuss the strike, and support was then, and continues to be, strong.

The recommendations made by the reviewers to the school (see Appendix B) focussed on three issues: the availability of the principal, student pride, and making parents feel welcome. All interview respondents agreed that the

recommendations of the reviewers, and the data on which they were based, were presented in written form, and discussed at length, at a staff meeting. They also agreed that the report seemed accurate and balanced, although they were concerned about some of the negative findings. The principal was particularly concerned about the problem of availability. Respondents agreed that more display of student work and more assemblies, more attempts to involve parents, and renewed efforts by the principal were the primary successfully implemented responses. They also agreed in anticipating little change: the principal believes that the strike will offset some modest gains in positive parent perception; teachers agree, although there is also doubt about the school's ability to have an impact on parent perceptions.

Regretably, these negative perceptions seem justified. The parent perception of the school is almost unchanged, and in fact the school has slipped in rank order from 7 to 9. Teacher perceptions are even more changed: the school has slipped in rank order from 2 to 7. These changes are not strong enough to be considered meaningful, but the slippage in rank order is a negative indication. The strike, and staff tensions arising from it, may well be a major cause.

School 2. The principal reports that the school was kept open during the strike, on the instructions of the School Board. There were no disputes on the picket line, and no subsequent discussion, amongst parents or staff, of the strike. The recommendations made by the reviewers focussed on strengthening academic press, and parent/staff cooperation in regard to school discipline policies; some suggestions regarding staff cohesion were also made.

All interview respondents agree that the review was circulated to staff in several sections, and discussed at a staff meeting. Some decisions were made for implementation by the staff and the principal. All respondents agreed that the staff generally found the report accurate, with some

provisos. On plans for change, the principal's recollection was more detailed, but not inconsistent with the teachers' memories of events: more emphasis on testing and getting at-task more quickly, and an attempt to encourage and welcome parents in the school were mentioned by principal and teachers. These changes were implemented, according to the respondents. All respondents believe that parents may perceive more commitment to academic emphasis, and sense of accountability amongst teachers, although one noted it "takes a lot to change people's perceptions." One respondent noted that staff change might improve teacher perceptions, and that parent perceptions might be negatively affected by the strike.

The survey data show that parent perceptions shifted very little, but the shift was positive with regard to academic press. Overall, this school slipped from 4 to 7 in the rankings, a change which it is hard to account for. Teacher perceptions, however, were strikingly improved. With regard to the "academic press" and the "social contract" scales, the shift was strong enough to qualify as meaningful in terms of the decision rules adopted. In ranking, the school moved from 3 to 1, in teacher perceptions. Such a sharp change amongst staff might well have a delayed impact amongst parents, such that a 1985 survey might show the anticipated parent shift of opinion, especially if external influences are neutral.

School 3. The strike had a major impact on the school, with some "very nasty scenes between parents and teachers on the picket line." Many parents brought their children to the school, and there was considerable pressure on teachers, to the point that two crossed the picket lines after the first day. Principals joined the strike on the third day. The school staff was very much opposed to the strike, and disturbed by it. However, a fully attended staff meeting at a private residence, seemed successful in resolving tensions amongst teachers. The reviewers suggested only some attention to

academic press and instructional problem solving, while agreeing on the positive climate existing.

Respondents agreed that the report on the school was presented in a staff meeting, with some discussion. The principal noted that only the data were presented. Teacher reaction to the data was consistent: they confirmed existing teacher opinion. "The school came out looking pretty good -- the way I thought we should have." Few changes were proposed; two respondents mentioned more emphasis on using test results, and on hallway discipline. These seem to have been implemented, although without much impact on teachers. Respondents generally felt that the review confirmed and supported school practices, so that no changes were needed, or in fact occurred.

With regard to changes in follow-up survey data, respondents split; two believe that the strike will have an impact on parent perceptions, and on teacher morale. Two believe that no changes will occur on the resurvey. These latter perceptions seem justified by the parent data: the very small shifts in parent perceptions are positive, and the school's rank order shift is insignificant. However, there are consistent negative shifts in staff perceptions; that of "principal activities" is strong enough to be considered meaningful. The change in rank order is very small, but the pattern is hard to ignore. Staff perception that the strike had no effect on the staff's cohesion seems inaccurate; the small effect measured here may well be temporary, but it cannot be dismissed.

School 4 The effect of the strike was not large. The whole staff was on strike, and there was little parent reaction. The reviewers recommended a number of changes in the school, focussing on the principal's role, on school interactions with parents, and on staff discussion of professional matters.

Respondents agreed that the full report of the reviewers was presented and discussed at a staff meeting. Generally the group accepted the report,

but felt that the special circumstances at the school made implementation very difficult. There was some attempt to focus on parents, and improve liaison. There is little sense that much has been achieved, or expectation that parent perceptions will be much improved on the resurvey. All respondents anticipated that a higher parent return rate of the survey would perhaps have a positive effect. Respondents all commented on severe resource cuts at the school, which it was anticipated might have a negative effect on teacher perceptions.

In fact there is a positive shift in parent perception, although it is only strong enough with respect to the principal to be considered meaningful. The school improved its position in the rank ordering slightly also. Amongst teachers, the shift in perceptions was negative, but not strongly so. he school did decline slightly in the rank ordering. Staff expectations of little change seem justified by the data; changes in perception will require much more effort than has been made here during the life of the project.

School 5. The school was very little affected by the strike: all teachers but one worked normally, and pupil attendance was about 70%, good considering the absence of school busses. Parent reaction supported "school as usual." The report of the reviewers suggested that little needed to be changed. The only concern expressed focussed on the potential for staff disagreement which seemed to be suggested by the data.

Respondents agreed that a written report was circulated, and followed by staff meeting discussion. Reactions were generally positive, although there were one or two surprises. There has been some focus on improving displays of student work, and on community relations. An attempt to improve the efficiency of staff meetings was made. Little has changed at the school: "we took a conscious choice to follow along with what we had been doing."

Respondents felt that parent opinions would be little changed, and that staff opinions should be positive.

In fact the parent data show a small but consistent positive shift, not strong enough to be considered meaningful or to change the rank ordering of the school. Staff perceptions were slightly more positive, and did improve the rank ordering of the school. In the light of the external influences, these are encouraging signs.

School 6. The strike was not a major divisive issue. After the first day, in which all teachers observed the picket lines, the school was closed. Parents accepted this, and calm prevailed. The report of the reviewers was extensive, and recommended a variety of changes in the school in an attempt to improve parent perceptions. A goal-setting exercise, involving parents and staff, assertive leadership by the principal, strengthened community support for school activities, and a renewed emphasis on academic work were all recommended.

A very detailed and careful summary of the reviewers' findings was circulated to staff, and this was extensively discussed in a staff meeting and at a home-and-school meeting. Respondents were unanimous in expressing surprise and disappointment over the parent attitudes. There was also agreement that a considerable increase in newsletters to parents, and meetings with them, some increase in extra-curricular activities, and a major attempt to improve student discipline were the main responses of the school. Respondents agreed also in expecting some improvement in perceptions, in particular relating to parental involvement, student discipline, and the principal.

Parent perceptions are slightly but consistently improved, which is an important change for this school, which has suffered excessively under the restraint program. It seems likely, given the recent history of the school,

that this is the start of a positive trend. Unfortunately, this positive shift of parent perception is offset by a slight negative shift in teacher perception, with the previously very positive perception of the principal being particularly affected. However, this is part of a general trend, previously attributed to external influences, and hence is not likely to be school-related.

This school remains something of an enigma. Two of the external observers were extremely impressed with the school, and with its staff. Commitment seems very high, and the effort and dedication of the principal seem exemplary. Yet the school is only modestly successful in the eyes of parents. A very much more thorough comparison of community expectations than was possible in this study would perhaps reveal an explanation for this.

School 7. The strike was effective in this school, which was closed. Teachers all respected the picket lines, and parents showed "no overt hostility." However, there was some dissatisfaction amongst parents, which has subsequently resulted in lower levels of parent support as volunteers. The reviewers recommended that change efforts should be focussed on improving academic press and teacher expectations; a collegial activity focussed on some aspect of the instructional program was recommended.

The respondents agreed that the data were presented in summary form and that they were discussed in a staff meeting. However, there was no agreement on staff reaction. Two respondents felt that the staff generally did not agree with the data and reviewers comments. Not surprisingly, little was done, in the recollection of the respondents, to implement the recommendations. One respondent mentioned a concern with displaying student work. The year was "a year of uncertainty." Respondents feared that threats of school closure due to declining enrolment, and reaction to the strike, might affect parent perceptions negatively. Similarly, uncertainty amongst

teachers, restraint-induced cuts, and the strike all might affect teacher perceptions, it was believed.

However, the school was in fact even more positively perceived by parents on the resurvey. The shift was positive on every scale, and strong on two, including parent perception of the principal. Teachers were even more positive, with a very clear shift in rank order from 9 to 3. Nothing in the project can account for these perceptions, and certainly the intervention was without impact. Yet of all the schools, this one has most clearly improved its status.

School 8. The principal recollected no serious problems on the picket lines. However, the staff was split, with two teachers working, and parents volunteered help to keep the school open. The school operated throughout the strike, with about 25% attendance. The reviewers made several recommendations: that the principal continue the work with parents, that the staff identify an instructional area needing attention and participate in a collegial problem solving approach to improving school practice, and that staff meetings be made more efficient.

The data was apparently circulated beforehand, and discussed at two staff meetings. There is no agreement amongst respondents on this issue. There was some staff surprise at the findings, but no serious interest or discussion, according to respondents. Some initiatives were taken, although respondents do not agree upon what was decided. There is agreement that some changes in student supervision have occurred. The principal noted some changes in teacher supervision practices, but teachers did not recall them, or did not associate them with the project. Respondents expected parent perceptions to remain more or less unchanged, although one commented on the impact of the strike: "they approached us on the picket line and weren't willing to listen to what we had to say." Teacher respondents seemed unusually militant,

bitter, and hostile to parents, perhaps as a consequence of the strike.

The survey data show stability in parent perception, although against the slight improvement of other schools this causes a slight decline in ranking. The teacher data show a consistent decline, as in several other schools, and the interviews suggest that this school was very strongly affected by the strike, and that the effects are continuing. This was sufficient to move the school slightly downward in the rankings. There are several new teachers on the staff.

School 9. The strike split the school staff, with some teachers attending on some days. Very few children attended. Parents were generally supportive of the teachers, and there were no picket line problems. Staff uneasiness lasted for some time after the strike, then disappeared. The episode is no longer considered important. The reviewers recommended that the principal make efforts to involve parents in discussions of instructional matters, and also encouraged teachers to initiate such discussions with parents. With regard to relatively low staff morale, the reviewers recommended improving feedback from parents to teachers, and a staff goal-setting exercise to stimulate discussion of instructional problems.

The written report was not presented to staff, although there was some discussion of it. The principal did not regard the report as entirely appropriate or helpful. However, all respondents agreed that some attempts to increase parent contact, via school newspaper, parent lounge, and monthly activities, were made. Additionally several in-service sessions focussing on school goals and their implementation, and on community involvement, were held. There is little doubt that serious attempts to implement some of the recommendations were made, despite the principal's reservations.

The parent data show a consistent trend to improved perceptions, and a shift upwards in ranking of the school, suggesting that the attention paid to

community involvement is beginning to have some impact. The teacher data are fairly negative however, and suggest that the strike may have had more impact than believed in the school. The improved perception of academic press is an exception, and may reflect the impact of the in-service sessions. This school seems to have made a start on climate improvement.

## FINDINGS: Conclusions

The general conclusions focus on three main areas: measuring school climate; the role of the principals in the project; and changes in school climate in the participating schools. The first can be discussed fairly briefly. Two aspects of the methodology were very successful, and are recommended to other researchers. Extensive and time-consuming efforts to elicit items for the questionnaires from parents and teachers did result in very inclusive survey instruments. The attempt to gather qualitative data to support the survey data, and aid in its interpretation, is also strongly recommended: the survey data would have been almost uninterpretable without the insights gathered from the interviews with principals and teachers.

However, the attempt to gather quantitative data by observation in the schools, using principals as observers, was not successful. The main reasons for this are that no training was possible, yet was necessary, and that insufficient time in each school was allowed for. Good and useful data could be developed from such observations, but not within the budget constraints here. In particular, observations of staff meetings seem likely to be very productive. One final note: the sample size of nine was poorly chosen: it prohibited really intensive qualitative study, yet was too small to allow convincing statistical analyses.

The role of the principals in the study was designed to facilitate data collection at the early stages, but more importantly to test the view that

school principals are key actors in the implementation of school level change. This is certainly one of the main conclusions drawn from recent American research on implementation. (See Fullan, 1979, for a detailed review of the literature.) The participation of the principals in data collection, and the use of the principals as reviewers to write the school-by-school prescriptions, was expected to develop belief in the accuracy and relevance of the data and hence commitment to the implementation of the prescriptions in the home school.

However, in only three schools, 2, 5, and 6, is it possible to trace a path through from the prescriptions, to principal and staff acceptance, to attempts to implement, and finally to positive shifts in the appropriate scales (see Table 17). Such a sequence was fundamental to the purposes of the study. The only possible conclusion, with regard to the role of the principal, is that it may well be a necessary condition for change, but it is clearly not a sufficient condition. External influences almost certainly swamped the initially good intentions of the volunteer principals in the project.

TABLE 17

Links Between Prescriptions and Scale Shifts, Selected Schools

| School No. | Prescription Emphasis | Parent Scale Shift | Teacher Scale Shift |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | A.P. | +0.3 | +4.1 |
| | S.C. | 0.0 | +4.8 |
| | T.E. | N.A. | +1.3 |
| 5 | T.E. | N.A. | +0.3 |
| 6 | P.A. | +1.5 | -3.5 |
| | A.P. | +0.2 | +0.4 |
| | W.W.E. | +0.4 | -0.4 |

Three schools did apparently have some success in implementing change in response to the prescriptions. However, the consistencies in Table 17 are far from convincing, with the possible exception of School 2. Clearly it is impossible to claim that either the use of the principal in the key change role or the attempt to change schools via the feedback of data on school status, were successful. No control school, in which similar measures of climate were made but not communicated, was included in the study, so that a clearcut measure of the impact of external influences is not available. In fact, since the data do show very considerable differences in the impact of the strike from school to school, it is unlikely that this would have been generalizable in any event. In addition, School 9 constitutes an accidental control school in that the data were not communicated to the staff. There is no clear-cut difference between this school and the others.

The simplest conclusion, and the most defensible, is that while the measures of climate were reasonably satisfactory, the school-by-school interventions were ineffective, in part because the principal is not a sufficiently powerful force for change, in the absence of other forces, and in part because the interventions were untimely. In a period of massive government and teacher union intervention into the normally rather placid life of the elementary school in British Columbia, the impact of a small attempt to modify school climate was quite insignificant.

## Bibliography

Anderson, C.A. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of research. Review of Educational Research, 52, 368-420.

Bossert, S.T., Dwyer, D.C., Rowan, B., and Lee, G.V. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(3), 34-64.

Brookover, W.B., Beady, C.H., Flood, P.K., Schweitzer, J., and Wisenbaker, J. (1979). School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Canadian Education Association. (1971). The man in the middle. Toronto, Ont.: CEA.

Canadian Education Association. (1979). Results of a gallup poll of public opinion in Canada about public involvement in education decisions. Toronto, Ont.: CEA.

Centra, J.A., and Potter, D.A. (1980). School and teacher effects: An interrelational model. Review of Educational Research, 50, 273-291.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. Toronto, Ont.: O.I.S.E. Press.

Goodlad, J.I. (1983). The school as a workplace. In G.A. Griffin (Ed.), Staff development. Chicago, Ill.: NSSE.

Goodlad, J.I. (1983a). A study of schooling: Some implications for school improvement. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 552-558.

Goodlad, J.I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

LaRocque, L. (1983). Policy implementation in a school district: A matter of chance? Burnaby, B.C.: Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University.

Leithwood, K.A., and Montgomery, D.J. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 52, 309-339.

Lipsky, M.M. (1978). Standing the study of public policy implementation on its head. In W.,D. Burnham and M.W. Weinberg (Eds.), American politics and public policy. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.

Little, J.W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 325-340.

McDill, E.L., Rigsby, L.C., Meyers (Jr.), E.D. (1977).Educational climates of high schools: Their effects and sources. In D.A. Erickson (Ed.), Educational organization and administration. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan.

McLaughlin, M., and Marsh, D.D. (1979). Staff development and school change. In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (Eds.), Staff development: New demands, new realities, new perspectives. New York: Teachers College Press.

McNergney, R.F., and Carrier, C. (1981). Teacher development. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). The structuring of organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., and Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Shoemaker, J., and Fraser, H.W. (1981). What principals can do. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 178-182.

Weick, K.E. (1976, March). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.

# APPENDIX A:

## Analysis of the Qualitative Data

## ANALYSIS OF THE QUALITATIVE DATA

These descriptions of the schools were derived from two types of data: the taped interviews with a random sample of teachers from each school, and the global impressions of each school recorded by the observers immediately after the observation period (see Note).

The results of the factor analysis of the questionnaire data provided a conceptual scheme for the organization of the qualitative data. Responses to the interview questions and comments contained in the global impressions were sorted into six categories, corresponding to the six factors. For each school, the interview data were examined for both similarities and differences among the respondents; in the same manner, the global impressions were examined for both similarities and differences among the observers. The convergence/divergence between the interview data and the global impressions were examined as well.

Each description, then, is divided into six parts, according to the six factors. Each part is further subdivided into the corresponding interview topics and global impression category, followed by a Factor summary, as outlined below:

---

NOTE All principals, respondents, and observers are referred to as "he" in the descriptions to preserve anonymity. The interview questions concerning grouping and retention practices, classroom interruptions, and teacher-initiated contact with parents were eliminated from the analysis because the responses were virtually identical for all 9 schools. None of the comments recorded in the global impressions corresponded to Factor 2.

FACTOR A

Principal Activities and Style

Interview Topic: Parental contacts

Global Impression: The principal

Summary

FACTOR B

Achievement, Challenge and Motivation

Interview Topics: Expectations and efficacy

Recognition

Homework

Use of test data

Global Impression: Academic press

Summary

FACTOR C

Warm Welcoming Environment

Interview Topics: Community support

Parents in the school

Global Impression: Overall atmosphere

Summary

FACTOR D

Social Contract

Interview Topics: Conduct; discipline policy

Global Impression: Conduct; supervision

Summary

FACTOR 1

Teacher-Principal Collegiality

Interview Topics: Principal-teacher relationship

Staff meetings

Staff cohesiveness

Global Impression: Staff relations

Summary

FACTOR 2

Solving Instructional Problems

Interview Topics: Instructional emphasis

Staff cooperation

Summary

SCHOOL #6

## FACTOR A: Principal Activities and Style

Interview Topic

Parental contacts. The respondents described the principal's rapport with parents as very good, and attributed this to such personal characteristics as being "humanistic" and "a good person." They said that parents find him open and approachable, always willing to discuss their problems with them, or anything else they might wish to talk about. To summarize, the respondents said that the principal's door is always open.

Global Impression

The principal. The observers described the principal as courteous and soft-spoken, well-organized and meticulous about keeping records of student achievement, and obviously proud of the school.

Summary

Both the respondents and the observers stress the personal characteristics of the principal in describing his style and activities, particularly his courtesy and gentleness, and his concern for the school and for student achievement.

## FACTOR B: Achievement, Challenge and Motivation

Interview Topics

Expectations and efficacy. The home background of the students is mainly upper middle-class and professional. Parents have high expectations for their children, urging them "to go as far as you can." One of the respondents cited as an example of the parents' high expectations the fact that even as early as the third or fourth grade children talk about university. Another respondent commented that the parents are very interested in their child's progress and

frequently ask how they can help at home. The students are described as being average or above in ability, good independent workers, and self-motivated, as well as having a positive attitude and as striving to do their best.

Recognition. In the classroom student achievement is recognized in a variety of ways, including displaying student work, showing student work to the principal, and using positive verbal reinforcement. On a school-wide basis, there is a formal awards ceremony held at the end of the school year, to which the parents are invited. There has been some difference of opinion on the staff, mainly between primary and intermediate teachers, as to the worthwhileness of having awards, and consequently the two groups have different award systems. Primary teachers award a certificate to every child in the class in recognition of whatever it is he or she excelled at, whether it be of an academic nature or not. There are two categories of awards at the intermediate level, earned certificates and "major" or "other" awards. The major awards recognize achievement in academic and sports areas, and include a special award for a student in Grade 7. Staff and students vote on the recipient of this award, which is more of a citizenship/service award than an academic one. Earned certificates are just what their name implies. There are approximately 15 types of these certificates, and each has specific criteria which a student must meet in order to "earn" that certificate. For example, in order to earn a certificate for academic achievement, the student must get an "A" in three or more subjects; a certificate for improvement requires that the student show improvement in four areas between the second and fourth report cards. The students decide which, if any, of the certificates they will attempt to earn, and although the system is voluntary, participation is high.

Homework. For all grades homework generally consists of completing classwork. Intermediate students must also occasionally study for tests, practice specific skills, and undertake a special project. The last is seen as a means of helping students learn to work independently.

Use of test data. Teachers monitor progress in the classroom through teacher-made tests and daily observation. In addition, students are given CTBS and district mathematics and reading tests. The respondents said these test results are recorded on the students' Permanent Record cards, and in this way student progress over the years can be traced. They also said the tests serve a diagnostic purpose, especially as a source of additional information about a child who is having difficulties.

## Global Impression

Academic press. The global impressions contained little information on this factor, and what there was was contradictory. One observer commented on the high expectations for student achievement, and another expressed concern about the amount of time spent in transition.

## Summary

There is considerable evidence of a high academic press -- the high expectations of the parents, the teachers' belief in the ability and positive attitude of the students, and the unique awards system. On the other hand, the respondents did not refer to the use of test scores on a school-wide basis, as had the principal. This might mean that test scores and their use are not discussed by the staff as a whole, or else that the teachers do not place as much importance on these issues as does the principal.

## FACTOR C: Warm, Welcoming Environment

### Interview Topics

Community support. The respondents described community support as very good, giving as evidence the high attendance at parent-teacher conferences and other school events, and parent involvement in fund-raising activities. They did allude to some strain between the school and the community in recent months over the restraint issue, however, with the teachers feeling that parent support was not as high as it had been in the past.

Parents in the school. According to the respondents, parents volunteer both to help out on special events and to work in the classroom or library on a regular basis.

### Global Impression

Overall atmosphere. Concerning the general environment, the observers noted in particular the good student-teacher relations and on the high level of extracurricular activity.

### Summary

The school appears to have developed a warm, welcoming environment, indicated by the high level of community support it enjoys and the nature of the teacher-student relationship.

## FACTOR D: Social Contract

### Interview Topic

Conduct; supervision. The respondents described the students as "basically good kids." There are no real discipline problems, although the students occasionally lack politeness in their treatment of one another. Another minor problem is that the students are sometimes rather loud and boisterous in the halls, but this is attributed mainly to the structure of the building. The school rules are announced early in the school year, and all teachers are expected to deal with misbehaviour whenever they encounter it.

Global Impression

Conduct; supervision. The observers agreed that the students were noisy and boisterous. They did not agree, however, as to the significance of this. One observer felt that the students' behaviour was a sign that the school was a lively and active place, whereas the other two expressed concern about the level of teacher supervision, not only because of student conduct in the halls, but also because of the untidiness of some of the classrooms and the occasional lapse of courtesy on the part of some students.

Summary

Both respondents and observers agree that there are no serious discipline problems, although they did express some concern about some minor infractions such as impoliteness, noisiness, and untidiness. These behaviours may be so low frequency that the staff as a whole does not consider them cause for concern. On the other hand, they may signal a need for the staff to discuss the issue.

## FACTOR 1: Teacher-Principal Collegiality

Interview Topics

Principal-teacher relationship. The respondents were highly laudatory in their description of the principal, noting especially his dedication, the long hours he works, and his gentle and courteous manner when dealing with students, teachers, and parents. In fact, one said "He is an example to us." The principal helps the teachers in many ways, suggesting materials and teaching techniques, helping with problems, and giving recognition for both curricular/instructional and extracurricular efforts. His main contribution in this respect, however, is the resource books which he has prepared and is encouraging the staff to prepare.

Staff meetings. Staff meetings are held monthly, and the participation is good, with the principal encouraging everyone to contribute and share his or her ideas. They are both informational (e.g., School Board and district decisions) and decision-making in nature. The kind of things the staff decides jointly include special events the school is sponsoring or solutions to problems which arise, such as the use of ramps and the front door, which posed difficulties earlier in the year.

Staff cohesiveness. The respondents described the staff as very close, a group which gets along and works well together. There are occasional staff parties, although few of the teachers are friends outside of school.

Global Impression

Staff relations. The observers described the staff as young, enthusiastic, and comfortable with one another. They noted in particular the evidence of professional cooperation and sharing, and the collegial, supportive atmosphere.

Summary

From the reports of both the observers and the respondents, principal-teacher and teacher-teacher relationships emerge as clearly collegial. The principal appears to play a major role in establishing this atmosphere.

**FACTOR 2: Instructional Problem-Solving**

Interview Topics

Instructional emphasis. The respondents outlined three ways in particular by which the staff has worked together on instructional/curricular matters:

(1) curriculum outlines, for example, in Physical Education and science;

(2) school resource books in various subject areas; and

(3) use of inservice days to discuss educational matters

Again, the importance of the principal in encouraging such activities was acknowledged.

Staff cooperation. The respondents emphasized how cooperative the staff is, sharing ideas and materials freely, and frequently discussing educational matters in the staffroom.

Summary

The respondents provided evidence of the problem-solving orientation of the staff, particularly in the area of curriculum articulation and elaboration.

SCHOOL #2

**FACTOR A: Principal Activities and Style**

Interview Topic

Parental contacts. According to the respondents, home-school relations are very important to the principal. He has had to work hard to overcome problems which had developed the previous year, when there was another principal at the school, but has succeeded in establishing good rapport with the parents. The respondents attribute this largely to the fact that the principal comes across "as one of them," is approachable, and understands their concerns. The principal also believes parents should be kept fully informed of school happenings, and the active Home and School Association and the newsletter program attest to this.

Global Impression

The principal. The observers described the principal as very visible and "on top of things."

Summary

From these descriptions, the principal appears to be hard-working and directed, in touch with what is happening in the school, and thus presumably able to identify problems as soon as they arise, and able to work with others.

**FACTOR B: Achievement, Challenge and Motivation**

Interview Topics

Expectations and efficacy. The home background of the students is mainly upper middle-class and professional. The parents are very concerned about and involved in their child's education, helping at home as much as possible, and they want to know what is happening at school. That their expectations are high is attested to by the frequency with which the children talk about university. The respondents said that the students enjoy school, like to

learn, are enthusiastic, want to do well, and have good work habits. One of the respondents said that he made clear to students his expectations about work habits and classroom behaviour, which he reinforced through weekly reports sent home to the parents, but there was no evidence of school-wide expectations in this respect.

Recognition. There is a formal awards ceremony held at the end of the year, to which parents are invited, to recognize academic excellence. The outstanding student in grade 7 is decided on by the whole staff, but the other awards are determined by the individual classroom teacher. The awards are given to encourage and reward excellence, and there was no mention made of the difference of opinion on staff on this issue as was found in most of the schools. In the classroom work is recognized through displaying student work, sharing student work with classmates, pointing out examples of good work, and while the system of weekly reports described earlier may be exceptional, giving certificates for good performance is more common.

Homework. Homework generally consists of completing classwork, although students are sometimes asked to study for tests or to practice skills. At the intermediate level, students may be given a special assignment, such as mathematics problems or using the public library. The rationale for giving these various kinds of homework tasks is that it develops responsibility and the ability to work independently.

Use of test data. A standardized reading test and district science and mathematics tests are given regularly. The results are used diagnostically, mainly on an individual basis. Two teachers, who work together closely, use the results to assess their teaching, by comparing them with the results of other years and with district norms, but this does not seem to be typical. There was a suggestion that not all staff members believe in the value of such tests. Teacher-made tests and daily observation are the common ways of assessing student progress.

Global Impression

Academic press. The observers were impressed with the facilities, and noted in particular the well-equipped music room, the computer room, the gym, the library, the seminar room, and the aide workshop. They did express some concern, however, about the academic press of the school, based on the following evidence:

(1) although students moved quickly to class, the at-task levels were low -- classes took quite a while to get started (it was suggested a warning bell might help); and

(2) solid "down to earth" instruction was missing in some classes.

The observers also mentioned that there was little display of student work and that perhaps the facilities were not used to full advantage.

Summary

The information concerning academic press was conflicting. High parent expectations, the teachers' belief in the students' attitude and ability, the awards system, and to some extent the attitude to homework suggests that the academic press should be high. On the other hand, the limited use of test results, the low at-task levels, the limited use of the facilities, and the 'relaxed' nature of some instruction suggest areas that can be improved.

**FACTOR C: Warm, Welcoming Environment**

Interview Topics

Community support. Community support is good, definitely improved since the difficulties of the previous year. Attendance at parent-teacher interview nights and at other school events is high.

Parents in the school. Parents are in the school frequently, mainly to pick up their children. They also help out on special events, both in the classroom and in the school.

Global Impression

Overall atmosphere. The observers noted in particular the good tone of the school, which they attributed largely to the principal, who was described as relaxed and considerate of others. The warmth of the interactions, principal-student, principal-teacher, student-teacher, and student-student, was also highlighted, especially the fact that the principal knows the students by name. Finally, the observers described the building and grounds as excellent and well-maintained.

Summary

That the school has established a warm, welcoming atmosphere is attested to by the frequency with which parents come to the school and the warmth of the interactions.

## FACTOR D: Social Contract

Interview Topic

Conduct; discipline policy. The students are energetic, and the teachers have to "keep tabs" on them, but they are good children and the school has no discipline problems. The school rules are announced early in the year, and repeated to the whole school at other times. Expectations about student behaviour are shared and consistently supported and enforced by all the teachers.

Global Impression

Conduct; supervision. The observers noted that discipline is well-maintained. The principal sets the tone, watching the children before school and at lunch. Disciplinary action was taken quickly and quietly, with emphasis on appropriate behaviour. The observers did express some concern about supervision, however, especially on the large playground.

Summary

Other than playground supervision, there do not seem to be any problems in this area. The staff has clear expectations about student behaviour, and for the most part students live up to them.

## FACTOR 1: Teacher-Principal Collegiality

Interview Topics

Principal-teacher relationship. The respondents described many ways in which the principal helps individual teachers, including:

(1) discussing previews, in particular the time distribution per subject;

(2) supporting teachers with parents;

(3) giving recognition for both curricular/instructional efforts and extracurricular efforts;

(4) observing in classrooms frequently; and

(5) knowing what the teachers are doing, what is going on in the classrooms.

Throughout the respondents emphasized the atmosphere of mutual respect, and the fact that the principal treated them as professionals.

Staff meetings. Staff meetings are held every two to three weeks, but if a problem should arise a meeting can be called quickly because the staff is in constant contact. The meetings are businesslike and productive: "we do what we set out to do." Decisions are made through consensus-building: "we accommodate each other," "there is no drawing of lines," and there is good participation. The topics discussed include problems (e.g., discipline), and procedural matters (e.g., assemblies, drills), although sometimes the meetings are more focused (e.g., school priorities, report cards).

Staff cohesiveness. The staff gets along well together, and after the problems of last year, this year things are "as smooth as smooth can be." The respondents emphasized how supportive the staff is of one another. One said,

"We don't spend a lot of time sitting around the staffroom -- I think because the level of work is high, no one sits in the staffroom right up until the bell rings, like in most schools -- but the time we spend together is good."

Global Impression

Staff relations. The observers described the staff as keen, active, friendly, open, and professional.

Summary

From all accounts, the staff is a collegial one. The only possible concern might be the absence of any mention of the principal providing teachers with feedback on their teaching, although that may be part of the frequent classroom observations so that the respondents did not feel it necessary to mention it specifically.

**FACTOR 2: Instructional Problem-Solving**

Interview Topics

Instructional emphasis. The respondents mentioned several curricular and instructional projects the staff has worked on together in the past, including a daily Physical Education program, a multicultural art program, and a language arts/reading program. This year they have identified several school priorities, but to date there had been no follow-up.

Staff cooperation. The respondents described the staff as very cooperative, freely sharing ideas and materials and frequently discussing educational matters.

Summary

While the staff is very cooperative in helping one another on an individual basis, there is less evidence of school-wide activities of a curricular or instructional nature.

SCHOOL #9

## FACTOR A: Principal Activities and Style

Interview Topic

Parental contacts. According to the respondents, the principal is very concerned about the home-school relationship, which is one of the reasons he is starting a parent advisory group. He believes that parents should be kept fully informed about school happenings, that "they have a right to know everything." The principal has had to overcome problems inherited from his predecessor, but "parents are coming around to feeling that he is approachable, although there is one segment of the parents we can't reach." According to one of the respondents, when a problem has arisen the principal makes a real effort to get in touch with the parents, even phoning them in the evening if he can not get hold of them during the day.

Global Impression

The principal. The observers described the principal as bright, and somewhat low-key and neutral in tone.

Summary

The principal seems to be handling a difficult situation "slowly but surely."

## FACTOR B: Achievement, Challenge and Motivation

Interview Topics

Expectations and efficacy. In describing the home background of the students, the respondents said, "One segment of the student body comes from middle-class, established, single-dwelling homes, but the rest come from furnished apartment dwellings and are highly transient." They commented on different aspects of parental involvement: "They are generally supportive and try to do what they can to help"; "Some are concerned about their child's

education but remain uninvolved because of their personal and financial problems"; and "They want their children to do well, but they are realistic about their expectations, they do not put extreme pressure on their child to excel."

The respondents agreed that there was a broad range of ability among the student population, but they also agreed that there were neither any outstandingly good students nor any outstandingly poor students. They did not agree as well when describing student attitude and work habits. One respondent said that the students have weak self-concept, perhaps because of their home background, and thus they lack confidence to try new things. They need a lot of encouragement, and turn off if things are too hard. Thus the teacher must create a trustful, caring environment so that the students will experience success, which will increase their self-confidence and lead to more success, and so on. Another respondent said that the students enjoy being at school, many because it is a good place to be, given their difficult home situations. He, like the previous respondent, believed that the emphasis in schools should be on social development, and although he felt that others on the staff might not accept this point of view, he said it was not something that the staff has discussed. The third respondent differed from the other two in stressing the child's academic development. He was very concerned about the students' poor work habits, and wished that the staff would develop a set of common expectations about student work, although this, too, is a topic the staff has not discussed.

Recognition. There is a formal awards ceremony, with the classroom teacher deciding which awards will be given and to whom. This is an issue which the staff has discussed; in fact, one respondent said that it has been "furiously debated." The respondent who expressed concern about the students' work habits believed in having an awards system, because it encourages and

rewards excellence and "we don't do enough of that." He counters the common argument against awards, that they create an elite, by pointing out that "in fact, we do very little for this group." The other two respondents were opposed to awards because they encourage reliance on extrinsic rewards and because they encourage competition. One of them said, "If we do our job, every child should learn, and therefore every child should be acknowledged."

Homework. Again on the topic of homework, the respondents were divided in opinion, although they agreed that this issue had not been discussed by the staff. Two respondents did not believe in homework because the students work hard all day and should not have to work at home and because there is something wrong with the teacher's planning if the students have to take work home. If students fail to complete work during class when sufficient time has been allotted, however, they would be expected to complete it at home. Some students may also have to do remedial work. The third respondent does sometimes assign homework, other than completion of classwork, in order to keep the unit progressing and to help the students develop appropriate work habits and independent learning. He feels that he gives "a fair bit of homework-- about 30 minutes a night."

Use of test data. CTBS is administered to the students in Grades 4 to 7, but the teachers do not have much confidence in test results. One respondent commented that "in some schools CTBS results go directly on Permanent Record cards and no one looks at them." Another said, "We don't use a lot of standardized testing here. If we do, it is just as an indicator of potential or to see if a child has improved over the year. We don't hang on that type of thing." Teacher-made tests and daily observations were considered to be more meaningful, relevant, and reliable means of assessing student achievement.

Global Impression

Academic press. The observers were rather critical of the academic press of the school, giving the following as reasons:

(1) the lack of evidence of challenge or excitement -- adjectives such as "listless", "dull", "no drive", "unexciting", "tired", "passive", were used by all the observers;

(2) the routine nature of the teaching activities, which involved much seatwork and use of workbooks, with no individualized or group work evident;

(3) the just-on-time or late arrival of teachers for class;

(4) the lack of evidence of planning; and

(5) the attitude of a couple of teachers in particular "who seemed to regard teaching as a secondary occupation."

That there might be some foundation to these criticisms is suggested by this quote from one of the respondents: "Sometimes I feel a little frustrated with the lack of businesslike attitudes by some staff -- I don't want to chat about last night's date or that kind of thing, I want to do my work. I feel very strongly that time in school should be spent on professional things."

Summary

There seems to be some real cause for concern about the academic press of the school -- teacher expectations, teacher attitude to testing, to homework, and to awards, all suggest a low academic press, and this is supported by the observers' comments. The number of times the respondents said that some issue had not been discussed implies that they should have been, and raises some questions about staff collegiality. These issues may not have been discussed in other schools, but the respondents there seemed to have some idea of how their colleagues felt.

## FACTOR C: Warm, Welcoming Environment

### Interview Topics

Community support. The respondents said that community support is not particularly good, that it is the same core of parents who attend events and support the school in other ways. On the other hand, one of the respondents added: "I think basically parents are happy with what is going on here. If not, they have avenues to express their concerns. It is up to them to take these options. We have an open-door policy, parents are free to call here any time."

Parents in the school. According to respondents, there are a couple of volunteers, but in general parent involvement in the school is not very high.

### Global Impression

Overall atmosphere. The observers were concerned about the overall absence of affect in the school, the neutral tone which prevailed, and the infrequency of student-teacher interaction.

### Summary

The school seems to have failed to create an environment which is perceived as warm and welcoming to others.

## FACTOR D: Social Contract

### Interview Topic

Conduct; discipline policy. Two of the respondents described student behaviour as good, and said that there were no real discipline problems. The third respondent said that student behaviour had really improved during the last year, although there were still some problems with impoliteness, disrespect for other's property, and deportment in the halls. The students are told regularly that they are expected to be polite, to do as they are asked, and to work to the best of their ability; in other words, there is not so much a set of school rules as expectations for appropriate behaviour.

According to the respondents, these expectations are shared and consistently enforced by all the teachers, the result of the principal's "really pushing supervision, shared responsibility for hallways, etc."

Global Impression

Conduct; supervision. The observers felt that student behaviour was generally good.

Summary

While student behaviour may have been a problem at one time, it does not appear to be one now. Staff effort to solve the problem has paid off.

**FACTOR 1: Teacher-Principal Collegiality**

Interview Topics

Principal-teacher relationship. The respondents described the principal as approachable and always willing to help, and stressed that he is supportive, non-judgmental, and non-threatening. He helps teachers by suggesting materials and teaching techniques, and alternate ways of doing things. In sum, the principal is "an educational resource person, available to help staff."

Staff meetings. Staff meetings are business-like and efficient, and consist of information dissemination (e.g., district items) and discussion/decision-making (e.g., special events, staff committee items). According to two respondents participation is good -- "minority opinions are expressed and accepted." The third, however, feels that it is generally the same people who express their opinions, that although theoretically everyone has an opportunity to participate, perhaps the pace of the meeting is too quick for everyone to speak up.

Staff cohesiveness. The staff was said to get along well, with no clashes or no cliques. The teachers socialize occasionally. For example, there are periodic staff lunches.

Global Impression

Staff relations. The observers felt there was some evidence of a split in the staff.

Summary

There seems to be some cause for concern about the collegiality of the staff, with the absence of open conflict more notable than the presence of cohesiveness. This may bear on the fact that the respondents prefaced many of their remarks with the statement that the issue had not been discussed by the staff.

## FACTOR 2: Instructional Problem-Solving

Interview Topics

Instructional emphasis. Concerning school-wide activities of a curricular or instructional nature, one of the respondents said, "I feel this is a major concern of the principal, but he is working into it, he can't initiate too many changes at once." The staff has worked together to develop the teacher supervision policy and uses inservice days to discuss educational matters. Also, at the beginning of the year the principal discusses their previews with the teachers, and "this gives him lots of input and he knows what is going on at each grade level."

Staff cooperation. There is good cooperation among the teachers, who freely share materials and ideas. As one respondent said, "You frequently hear talk in the staffroom of the 'this is how I taught that unit last year' type." On a less positive note, one of the respondents commented, "There is not the same sharing of committee work and extracurricular activity work -- that falls on the same people."

Summary

There appears to be cause for concern about the problem-solving orientation of the staff as a whole.

SCHOOL #1

## FACTOR A: Principal Activities and Style

Interview Topic

Parental contacts. In the past there has been little parental input, but that should change since the principal has recently been instrumental in forming a parent advisory committee. The home-school relationship is very important to the principal, and he has an open house policy, that is, parents are free to come in and discuss matters with him. The respondents describe the principal's rapport with the parents as good.

Global Impression

The principal. The observers did not comment on the principal's style and activities.

Summary

It appears that while there have been no problems, neither can the home-school relationship be described as close, although this may change as a result of the present principal's efforts.

## FACTOR B: Achievement, Challenge and Motivation

Interview Topics

Expectation and efficacy. According to the respondents, the home background of the students is mainly lower middle- and working-class, with a sizable Native Indian segment. The parents are described as concerned about their child's progress, but generally uninvolved except when the child is having difficulties. One respondent commented that a few parents seem to keep their children home from school for inappropriate reasons. The children are said to enjoy school, but for social reasons, such as the opportunity to be with other children, rather than intellectual ones. Concerning the children's

ability, the respondents commented that in general the students' work is "O.K.", and noted the importance of the learning assistance teacher in helping children "work at their own level."

Recognition. There is a formal awards ceremony at the end of the year to which parents are invited. The "top" girl and boy in grade 7 are given special recognition, and the whole staff votes on the recipient of this award, who is chosen more for contributions to the school than for academic excellence. Other awards for academic excellence and improvement, sports, and citizenship/service are given to students in each class. The decisions as to which awards are to be given and to whom are made by the classroom teachers so that, for example, a primary teacher might give every child in the class a certificate for something at which he or she excelled, while an intermediate teacher might give only citizenship/service awards. According to the respondents there is a difference of opinion on the staff concerning the value of awards, with many objecting mainly because it is impossible to select the "best" student from among a group of good students and because it is damaging to the students who do not receive an award. The teachers prefer to encourage and reward achievement in other ways, such as displaying student work in the classroom or halls, showing student work to the principal, sending the students work or a "happy-gram" home to the parents, and using stars and stickers.

Homework. No homework is assigned at the primary level, although the children are encouraged to practice printing and other skills. Intermediate teachers generally require students to complete their classwork, and may assign other work to move the unit along if they are getting behind, but this is rare.

Use of test data. CTBS is given to all students in grades 2 to 7, and the results are recorded on the students' Permanent Record cards. These data

provide the teacher with diagnostic information, and supplement the information the teacher gets from other sources such as teacher-made tests and daily observation.

Global Impression

Academic press. The observers noted that the school is a busy place and that things are done efficiently. They were concerned about two aspects of classroom life, however: (1) the lack of challenge; and (2) the neutral atmosphere -- the lack of vitality, laughter, and a sense of fun.

Summary

There were several indications that the academic press of the school is not as strong as it might be, including the emphasis on the social rather than academic aspects of school life, the reluctance to reward academic excellence, the limited role of standardized tests, and the lack of challenge noted by the observers.

## FACTOR C: Warm, Welcoming Environment

Interview Topics

Community support. The respondents described the community support as very good, citing as evidence the high attendance at school events and the recent efforts of some community groups to raise funds to support the extracurricular program which was cut by the restraint program.

Parents in the school. According to the respondents, parents help out on special events, although only a couple work in classrooms on a regular basis.

Global Impression

Overall atmosphere. The observers expressed some concern about the overall tone of the school. They described it as businesslike, low-key, quiet, orderly, and functional, but lacking dynamism, with little evidence of interaction and affect. One observer noted that there seemed to be little attention paid to hall and classroom decorations.

Summary

The evidence about the environment or atmosphere was mixed. On the one hand, the good community support suggests that the parents find the school to be warm and welcoming. On the other hand, the observers found the school to be rather neutral in tone, lacking in warmth, interaction, and vitality.

## FACTOR D: Social Contract

Interview Topic

Conduct; discipline policy. The respondents described the student conduct as good, and said there were no problems. School rules are announced early in the year, and repeated at other times. The teachers have discussed the discipline policy, and all have common expectations about appropriate student behaviour.

Global Impressions

Conduct; supervision. The observers commented particularly how well-behaved the students were, given the minimal amount of direction they had. They also noted that the students displayed self-discipline and responsibility.

Summary

From the reports of both the respondents and the observers, the school has no problems at all in the area of student behaviour.

## FACTOR 1: Teacher-Principal Collegiality

Interview Topics

Principal-teacher relationships. The respondents described the principal as approachable, supporting teachers in their dealings with parents, giving them recognition for their extracurricular efforts, and helping them get materials. Although they feel the principal is approachable, the respondents did not appear to discuss curricular/instructional concerns with the principal with any frequency.

Staff meetings. Staff meetings are held once a month, in the morning before classes start. Topics discussed include special events (e.g., Hallowe'en party), professional matters (e.g., Pro-D day), and problems (e.g., litter, children missing the bus). Everyone on the staff has the opportunity to give input, and the principal always tries to discover how everyone feels, but the respondents felt that some participate more than others.

Staff cohesiveness. The respondents described the staff as getting along well together, and said that there were occasional staff parties. They did not give any other evidence of staff cohesiveness.

Global Impression

Staff relations. Only one observer commented on this factor, to say that the staff seems sociable and agreeable.

Summary

The lack of comment by both respondents and observers raises questions about the level of staff collegiality. While relationships among teachers and between teachers and the principal are cordial, there does not seem to be a strong orientation to discussing professional matters.

## FACTOR 2: Instructional Problem-Solving

Interview Topics

Instructional emphasis. The examples of the staff working together on professional matters given by the respondents included:

(1) the use of inservice days to discuss educational matters;

(2) the oral discussion of previews with the principal; and

(3) the development of shared expectations concerning student behaviour.

There was a suggestion that curricular/instructional matters are essentially the concern of the classroom teacher.

Staff cooperation. The respondents expressed more enthusiasm in answering this question than any other. They described the staff as very cooperative, and emphasized that the teachers shared ideas and materials freely. At the intermediate level, there is some class "swapping" for specialty areas.

Summary

While the staff helps one another on an individual basis, there does not seem to be a strong orientation towards working on curricular and instructional problems as a staff, i.e., on a school-wide basis.

SCHOOL # 4

## FACTOR A: Principal Activities and Style

Interview Topic

Parental contacts. Home-school relations is a priority with the principal, and he deals immediately with all parent concerns, before they become a problem. The principal knows all the children and most of the parents, and this has contributed to the excellent rapport he has with the parents.

Global Impression

The principal. The observers described the principal as organized, precise, and quiet.

Summary

The principal is aware of what is happening and how people feel, and is thus in a position to deal with potential problems quickly and effectively.

## FACTOR B: Achievement, Challenge and Motivation

Interview Topics

Expectations and efficacy. The major concern of the respondents about the students' home background is the amount of time they spend in daycare, with other children. The number of different groups of adults to whom they must relate and the lack of individual adult attention they get results in certain emotional needs which the school must and does meet through the learning center approach, which is a relaxed, pleasant, and creative experience for the children. The teachers expect student work to meet their high standards -- as one respondent said, "I don't accept slipshod work" -- but prepare them well for assignments, in order to motivate them.

Recognition. There is no formal awards ceremony, because the staff believes this practice encourages competition and reliance on extrinsic rewards. Instead excellence is encouraged and rewarded through display of student work, sharing of student work with classmates and at school assemblies, and use of positive verbal reinforcement.

Homework. Homework is not assigned, but students are encouraged to take readers and library books home. Some students are given remedial work, and parents are involved when this is the case.

Use of test data. Although the district encourages the use of standardized tests, the staff does not believe they are useful because they are not related to what is being taught and because some students freeze up when faced with them. Instead they rely on teacher-made tests, daily observations, and teacher records of skill development, as these are considered meaningful, relevant, and reliable.

Global Impression

Academic press. The observers were very impressed with the design of the school, its suitability for instruction, and the abundant resources available. They did express some concern about the lack of data concerning student achievement and the outcomes of educational practice, the lack of instruction, and the fact that some instructional time was not used fully.

Summary

Some questions about the academic press of the school are raised by the emphasis on the social and emotional development over the intellectual, the attitude towards awards and tests, and the nature of teaching activities.

## FACTOR C: Warm, Welcoming Environment

### Interview Topics

Community support. Community support is considered to be very good, as is demonstrated by the high attendance at parent-teacher conferences and other school events.

Parents in the school. Many parents are in and out of the school to pick up their child, but there are few volunteers working in the school.

### Global Impression

Overall atmosphere. The observers were very favourably impressed with how well-designed the school is and how beautifully it is decorated with student work. They commented on the warm interactions and the calm, cosy, comfortable atmosphere, and attributed these characteristics largely to the efforts of the principal. They also noted that parents appeared to feel welcome.

### Summary

There appears to be no doubt that the school has successfully created a warm, welcoming environment.

## FACTOR D: Social Contract

### Interview Topic

Conduct; discipline policy. The respondents emphasized how hard they have to work on helping the children develop self-discipline. They describe the children as difficult and somewhat aggressive, settling their problems by fighting. This is thought to be the result of the amount of time they spend with other children in daycare. The teachers and principal frequently discuss what constitutes appropriate behaviour and acceptable ways of handling different situations with the children, in class and at school assemblies. Expectations about student behaviour are shared and consistently enforced by all the staff.

Global Impression

Conduct; supervision. The observers noted that the children were closely supervised.

Summary

This is an area in which the staff has worked together to solve a problem, and according to the observers, they have been successful.

**FACTOR 1: Teacher-Principal Collegiality**

Interview Topics

Principal-teacher relationship. The respondents said that although the principal's time is limited because of his heavy teaching load, he is approachable and always willing to help. This generally consists of suggesting and sharing materials.

Staff meetings. Staff meetings deal with specific problems, but educational matters are generally discussed informally, in the staffroom.

Staff cohesiveness. The respondents were most emphatic about how very cohesive and close the staff was. According to one, "It makes this a special place to work, compensates for the difficulties of the job." They said this is enhanced by the fact that some of the teachers are friends outside of school, but mainly by the fact that they share a common educational philosophy.

Global Impressions

Staff relations. The observers commented that this was a harmonious staff who obviously shared a common philosophy and set of classroom routines.

Summary

The evidence suggests that this is a highly collegial staff who espouse the same educational philosophy and follow the same educational practices.

## FACTOR 2: Instructional Problem-Solving

### Interview Topics

Instructional emphasis. Curricular and instructional decisions are essentially the responsibility of the classroom teacher, and as they are all experienced professionals, the principal has little input in this area. Because the teachers share a common educational philosophy and have worked together for some time, they know what one another is doing and thus there is little need for staff discussions of these matters. Once or twice a year the staff decides on a theme, which is developed by all teachers in their class. The principal is responsible for developing a central resource center relevant to the theme. Also, the principal takes all the children once a week for music, a program he has established in the school.

Staff cooperation. The staff is very cooperative, freely sharing ideas and materials. Educational matters are frequently discussed, but it is agreed that the staffroom is a place to relax, to get away from the troubles for awhile, and complaints about students of the "so-and-so did this" variety are taboo.

### Summary

The teachers do not work cooperatively to identify curricular or instructional problems and to plan school-wide programs to resolve them -- these are the responsibility of the individual classroom teacher. The principal's role is essentially collegial rather than supervisory.

SCHOOL #8

## FACTOR A: Principal Activities and Style

Interview Topic

Parental contacts. The school is just starting a parent group, and according to one of the respondents the principal sets a good tone at these meetings, by being matter-of-fact, straightforward, and easy to deal with. Also the principal knows most of the parents and all of the students, and this contributes to the good rapport he has developed with the parents.

Global Impression

The principal. The observers noted two things in particular about the principal: his high visibility, on the playground, in hallways, in classrooms; and the amount of time he spends interacting with a wide variety of people.

Summary

The principal's high visibility and his rapport with parents, teachers, and students suggests that he is in a position to know what is happening and to deal with potential problems quickly.

## FACTOR B: Achievement, Challenge and Motivation

Interview Topics

Expectations and efficacy. The home background of the students is mixed, with many coming from a fairly well-to-do section of town and the rest from an Indian reserve. The parents, the former group in particular, want to be informed if their child is having difficulties. The range of ability within the student population is broad, but in general the students are good workers and seem to like school.

Recognition. There is not a formal awards ceremony at the school. As one respondent explained, "There is not much in the way of academic rewards. The previous administration did not approve of them, because they encourage competition and they are damaging to the students who do not receive one. But I think this is changing." Achievement is recognized in the classroom, however, by displaying student work, sharing student work with classmates, showing student work to the principal, and, of course, using positive verbal reinforcement. In addition, the names of students who are a member of the "100 book" club or who win the Canada Fitness Awards are announced at assemblies.

Homework. No homework is assigned at the primary level. Intermediate students are expected to complete their classwork, and occasionally to work on independent projects.

Use of test data. A standardized test was given to the students recently, as part of a new district assessment program, but the results have not come back yet, and the respondents were not sure what the test was or what the rationale for giving it was. They felt that the information was for district rather than school use, although one said that possibly it would be used diagnostically to identify problem areas. Another said, "The rumour is that it is going to be used to identify good and poor teachers, because the district has scored less well in recent years on provincial assessments."

Global Impression

Academic press. The observers noted that work got underway quickly, and that some of the intermediate grades continued to work for some time after the dismissal bell rang, suggesting good work orientation.

Summary

There were indications that concern for academic press was not strong in the past, especially in the areas of teacher expectations, recognition of student work, and use of test data, but that changes are underway.

## FACTOR C: Warm, Welcoming Environment

Interview Topics

Community support. The respondents gave the impression that community support has not been good, but that that situation might be changing. One described it as "mediocre compared to the average school, but probably more than other schools in the district." He attributed the lack of community support to the transient nature of some of the population and the apprehensiveness of Native Indians about coming to the school. Another said that there had been little contact until recently between the home and school, except for parent -teacher conferences, but that a parent advisory committee was being established, and support for it appeared to be good. This group was seen as a fund-raising group, "a support system more than anything else."

Parents in the school. There are the "same few" parents who help out at special events and two or three classroom volunteers.

Global Impression

Overall atmosphere. The observers were most impressed with the warm, positive teacher-student and student-student interactions. They used such adjectives as "happy", "active", "lively", and "energetic" to describe the atmosphere. They also commented on the role the principal plays in setting the relaxed and casual but caring tone and the fact that he knows the students by name and is able to ask them about their interests and concerns. He obviously knows what is happening in the lives of the students.

Summary

There is much evidence that the school has successfully created a warm and welcoming environment, and that the principal has played a key role in this. If the parents were not involved in the past, they may now discover that the atmosphere is changing.

**FACTOR D: Social Contract**

Interview Topic

Conduct; discipline policy. Again there is evidence of changes in the school: "Life around here has certainly improved the last couple of years -- there's more structure now, it makes it a happier place to be." The children are described as"nice"-- they treat each other well, they are respectful, and they are easy to get along with. There are shared expectations of appropriate student behaviour, and teachers are expected to intervene whenever necessary.

Global Impression

Conduct; supervision. The observers remarked that the students were generally well-behaved.

Summary

Once more there is an indication of a problem in the past which the staff has worked on successfully. Student conduct is good, and there do not appear to be any serious discipline problems.

**FACTOR 1: Teacher-Principal Collegiality**

Interview Topics

Principal-teacher relationship. The principal is described as approachable and always willing to help, "someone you can talk to, go to with a problem." Another way he offers help to teachers is through classroom observations, which take place with new teachers, teachers who are due for a report, and teachers who request it. The result of these observations is "excellent feedback" and "positive, relevant, helpful suggestions."

Staff meetings. Staff meetings are held two or three times a month. They are generally informational in nature, to bring everyone up-to-date on such matters as committee reports, and to make decisions about school events and the like. A special meeting might be called to examine, for example, the Ginn reading program -- these meetings are more like a staff workshop. Teachers contribute to the agenda, and participation is good. One respondent remarked, "Unlike the previous principal, decisions are not all made beforehand."

Staff cohesiveness. The staff was described as very cohesive, very close over the last couple of years -- "There is an easy, relaxed atmosphere on staff and with the students." Given as evidence of the cohesiveness were the amount of joking and laughing that went on among staff members, the monthly staff lunches, and the periodic staff parties "which are famous throughout the district." One respondent emphasized the importance of staff cohesiveness because "one teacher can have a negative effect on a number of others, which isn't conducive to sharing, and we have to come into contact over resources, library time, gym time, etc."

Global Impressions

Staff relations. The observers commented on the good staff morale, and described the teachers as hard-working, committed, fun-loving, enthusiastic.

Summary

There is considerable evidence of the collegiality of the staff.

**FACTOR 2: Instructional Problem-Solving**

Interview Topics

Instructional emphasis. The staff has worked together to develop consistent expectations about appropriate student behaviour -- "The principal knows how to lead the group without enforcing his own opinion: he led the staff to work on this problem." Also, teachers may hold a workshop in their

area of expertise to help other teachers. The general thrust of the comments, however, was that curricular and instructional decisions are essentially made by the classroom teacher -- "We find it easier to plan alone, to work alone."

Staff cooperation. Cooperation among the teachers is described as "great -- it is a nice surprise to find lists, units, ideas in my box which have come from a number of people."

Summary

Cooperation on professional matters occurs frequently on an individual basis, but less so on a school-wide basis, particularly if the issue is curricular or instructional in nature.

SCHOOL #3

**FACTOR A: Principal Activities and Style**

Interview Topic

Parental contacts. According to the respondents, the principal's rapport with parents is excellent. He knows most of the parents, is on friendly terms with them, and they feel free to come and talk to him. Parents are impressed and reassured by the facts: (1) that the principal not only knows students by name, but is familiar with their progress; and (2) that he is knowledgeable about all school programs. The principal has established a home-school program for students having behavioural or academic problems, which has proved very successful. Finally, there is an active parent advisory council consisting of parent representatives, the principal, and teacher representatives.

Gloabl Impression

The principal. The observers noted the high visibility of the principal, the large extent to which his time is spent interacting with people, and the positive nature of his relationships with others. They remarked in particular that the office area is an active, vital area in which the principal, vice-principal, and secretary are kept very busy, mainly in interacting with students, teachers, and non-school visitors.

Summary

According to these reports the principal is a person who has established good relationships with parents, students, and co-workers, and who is in touch with what is happening. Both these characteristics help the principal to identify potential problems and deal with them immediately.

## FACTOR B: Achievement, Challenge and Motivation

Interview Topics

Expectations and efficacy. The respondents described the community as good. Parents back the teachers up, and there is no conflict between the home and the school. Parents are concerned about and involved in their child's education, and help their child at home as much as possible. The students enjoy school, like to learn, are confident, are not shy about asking for help, and want to do well, to excel, especially when they like the teacher. Their work habits are very good, which is attributed to the high expectations of the teachers -- one respondent said "Quality of work is important to me, and I think to other teachers," and another said, "We have to work with students who transfer here, to bring their work habits up to our standards."

Recognition. There is an awards ceremony held at the end of the year, to which parents are invited. According to the respondents it is treated as an important occasion, "a big deal,"and the teachers dress up for the occasion. Awards are given for academic excellence and improvement, sports and fitness, and citizenship/service, all decided by the individual classroom teacher. Intermediate teachers are likely to favour this form of recognition of achievement, because they believe it encourages and rewards excellence. Primary teachers, on the other hand, believe that it is damaging to students who do not receive an award and also that it is difficult to select the "best" student. This conflict is resolved by having the primary students attend the assembly to watch the distribution of prizes to the intermediate students, but then returning to their classroom where all are given a prize for something. Student achievement is recognized in a variety of other ways:

(1) using positive verbal reinforcement (this was emphasized by all the respondents);

(2) displaying student work in the hall and classroom;

(3) showing student work to the principal;

(4) displaying student work on the special bulletin board in the office area;

(5) sending student work, or a "happy-gram," home to the parents; and

(6) principal and vice-principal supervision of homework, in special cases, as part of a home-school program designed to help children having difficulties.

Homework. Primary students are occasionally asked to practice or review skills, but in general homework is rarely assigned. At the intermediate level, homework consists of completing classwork and is given frequently. The rationale for this is that it enables students to cover work in more depth than is possible in class and to have more time with the topic.

Use of test data. Such means of assessing student progress as teacher-made tests and daily observations are considered to be the most meaningful, relevant, and reliable. District mathematics tests and a standardized reading test are administered, but they are used as a diagnostic tool for individual children, as an additional source of information about a child.

Global Impression

Academic press. The observers expressed two main concerns:

(1) that a large number of students arrived late, and neither they nor the teachers appeared particularly concerned; and

(2) that there was not much evidence of planning.

On the other hand, most classes got down to work quickly, many students remained after school to work in the library, and the art work and the gymnasium program seemed to be very good.

Summary

The information concerning academic press is conflicting. On the positive side are the high parent expectations, student attitude, the high

teacher expectations concerning work habits, and the recognition of student achievement. On the negative side are the limited use of test data, the apparent lack of planning, and the number of students arriving late.

## FACTOR C: Warm, Welcoming Environment

### Interview Topics

Community support. Community support was said to be "super," and the evidence cited included the high attendance at parent-teacher conferences and other school events, the number of volunteers for special events, and such contributions as building the adventure playground.

Parents in the school. Parents volunteer to help out on special school events, special classroom events, and in the classroom on a regular basis.

### Global Impression

Overall atmosphere. The observers noted in particular the frequency of interactions, all of which were described as warm, and the abundance of smiles and laughter. They also noted the overall tone, and the active extracurricular program which involved many participants and spectators.

### Summary

The frequency with which parents come to the school, the frequency of warm interactions, and the student support of school events, all suggest that the school has established a warm, welcoming environment.

## FACTOR D: Social Contract

### Interview Topic

Conduct; discipline policy. There is one major school rule: respect for one another. The emphasis is on the positive -- "We expect good behaviour," and in a sense such things as the library, computers, and extracurricular activities are rewards -- and expectations concerning student behaviour are shared and enforced by all the teachers. Student behaviour is good and there

are no discipline problems. Any major infraction is dealt with firmly by the administration.

Global Impression

Conduct; supervision. The observers found the students to be well-dressed and polite, although the overflowing lost-and-found rack suggested that they treat their possessions carelessly. They were concerned, however, with the level of supervision, especially when the students were kept indoors -- the task seemed to be too large for the two people assigned.

Summary

While in general student behaviour was good and there do not seem to be any discipline problems, teacher supervision of students seems somewhat casual.

**FACTOR 1: Teacher-Principal Collegiality**

Interview Topics

Principal-teacher relationship. The respondents described the principal as always willing to help, approachable, and knowledgeable about all programs, even specialty areas. Two of the respondents transferred to the school specifically to work with the principal, in spite of the inconvenience of a long drive, and the third described his transfer as "my lucky day." The principal meets with each teacher monthly to discuss their previews and the progress of each student. He offers suggestions about materials and teaching techniques during these sessions, and updates his records of student progress. Thus he keeps up-to-date on what the teachers are doing and what is going on in each classroom.

Staff meetings. There is one staff meeting per month, and teachers can add to the agenda by listing concerns on the sign-up sheet. Participation is good. The purpose of the meeting is to keep the staff informed of

professional development activities in the district, and to discuss special school events (e.g., the Christmas concert)and problems (e.g., supervision).

Staff cohesiveness. The respondents said that the staff got along well. Teachers joke and laugh together a lot, and there are periodic staff parties and other social functions.

Global Impression

Staff relations. The observers remarked that the staffroom atmosphere was outstanding: warm, cheerful, friendly, collegial, and suggesting high morale.

Summary

There is considerable evidence of the collegiality of the staff and of the importance of the principal-teacher interactions on curricular/ instructional matters.

**FACTOR 2: Instructional Problem-Solving**

Interview Topics

Instructional emphasis. The respondents considered the principal to be an educational leader, one who is knowledgeable about all school programs and for whom students and teaching are the main concern. The kinds of school-wide curricular and instructional activities cited include:

(1) the use of inservice days to discuss educational matters;
(2) monthly discussions of previews (principal-teacher);
(3) regular discussion of student progress (principal-teacher);
(4) frequent discussion of educational matters, both formally and informally;
(5) development of a home-school program to help children who are having behavioural or academic problems; and
(6) development of consistent expectations of student behaviour.

Staff cooperation. The respondents stressed how very cooperative the staff was, freely sharing ideas and materials, and frequently discussing educational matters in the staffroom.

Summary

Through his monthly meetings with the teachers, the principal receives some information on teacher plans and has an opportunity to make suggestions. There is no evidence, however, of the teachers working cooperatively to identify problems in curricular or instructional areas and to plan school-wide programs to resolve them.

SCHOOL #5

**FACTOR A: Principal Activities and Style**

Interview Topic

Parental contacts. According to the respondents, the relationship between home and school had not been particularly good in the past. This principal, however, believes such relationships are very important, vital in fact, and has worked very hard to make parents feel at ease about coming into the school and discussing their concerns with the professionals. The results of his efforts are becoming evident this year, in terms of increased parental support and involvement.

One of the ways by which the principal has attempted to make the parents feel welcome in and a part of the school is morning meetings. Each week he invites 10 or so parents to meet with him at the school. He takes them on a tour of the school, including visits to their children's classrooms to observe what is happening there, and then returns to the library to discuss their concerns with them informally over coffee. Another benefit of these meetings is that the principal has an opportunity to get to know all the parents on an individual basis.

The fact that the principal knows all the students also contributes to the good rapport he has established with the parents. They are reassured to discover that the principal knows who their child is and how he/she is doing.

Global Impression

The Principal. The observers described the principal as highly organized, well-informed about the school and the community, and a significant influence on the operation of the school.

Summary

The principal is portrayed as a person who knows the teachers, the students, and the parents, and who is thus in a position to identify problems in their early stages and to mobilize the appropriate people to resolve the problems.

**FACTOR B: Achievement, Challenge and Motivation**

Interview Topics

Expectations and efficacy. The community is described as mainly working class, with a sizable Native Indian segment, and it was pointed out that many of the students live in trailer parks. As a consequence, the language the children are familiar with at home is frequently different from that used at school. In addition, books and reading are not a significant part of the home life of many of the students. In order to help the students improve their language and reading skills, the staff worked as a group to plan and implement several school-wide programs. According to the respondents, the students are cooperative and capable, and the consistent and persistent efforts of the teachers over the last couple of years has resulted in considerable improvement of both the students' self-image and their achievement.

Recognition. All teachers recognize student achievement in a variety of ways in the classroom, but there is also a school-wide award system designed to encourage and reward achievement. At a monthly assembly, each teacher awards one, or possibly two or three, certificates for achievement or improvement or perhaps a special project. At the end of the year there is a formal awards ceremony which parents are invited to attend. On this occasion each teacher awards five certificates in such areas as academic excellence, academic improvement, sports, and citizenship/service.

Homework. No homework is assigned at the primary level, other than to practice the skills they have been learning. Homework at the intermediate level generally consists of completion of classwork. In addition, students occasionally are assigned individual projects, and they may work on these projects at home. Finally, some students have to do remedial work at home, but parents are generally involved in such programs.

Use of test data. Students are continually assessed by their teachers, through teacher-made tests and daily observations. The purpose of these assessments is generally to see whether the students are ready to move on to the next unit (or topic or skill). In addition, all students in grades 2 to 7 are given CTBS twice a year. Especially at the intermediate level, these results are used to identify areas of weakness, mainly on a class or school-wide basis rather than on an individual basis, and several school-wide programs were designed to address the problems identified by the test scores. Now test results are also used to monitor improvement.

Global Impression

Academic press. The observers described the teachers as hard-working and well-organized, and the students as being well-aware of classroom routines and behaviour expectations and as settling into classroom activities in a quick and orderly manner.

Summary

The school seems to have a strong academic press, with much effort being spent on identifying and resolving curricular and instructional problems cooperatively. The academic orientation is evident in the individual classrooms, but also in the joint activities of the staff.

## FACTOR C: Warm, Welcoming Environment

### Interview Topics

Community support. While in the past community support was not particularly good, according to the respondents "The staff has discussed this problem and is making an effort to make parents feel at ease in the school." Their efforts have resulted in a large improvement in community support over the last two years. Increased attendance at parent-teacher conferences and at other school events was cited as evidence of this improvement. One of the respondents gave as an example the parent turnout for a short play her students put on recently: "Two-thirds of the parents made an effort to come to the school during the day to see their child in a play which only lasted 10 minutes."

Parents in the school. Parents help out on special events such as Sports Day and Hot Dog Day, and a couple of mothers work in the classroom on a regular basis. This, too, is a sign of the improvement in community relations. The respondents explained that several people offered their time at the beginning of the school year, whereas in the past the staff could not count on having volunteers to help out on special events, even when they asked for them.

### Global Impressions

Overall atmosphere. The observers noted the frequency and the warmth of student-teacher interactions.

### Summary

The school has developed a warm, welcoming environment, one in which parents have been made to feel comfortable and in which students are treated with warmth. Again there is evidence of the staff working together to identify and resolve a problem.

## FACTOR D: Social Contract

### Interview Topics

Conduct; discipline policy. The students were described as "basically good kids," although they are somewhat aggressive (for example, they tend to settle their problems by fighting) and sometimes impolite, especially in their treatment of one another. According to the respondents the staff has worked hard to help students overcome their lack of self-discipline. Their strategies include:

(1) developing expectations of student behaviour which are consistently supported and enforced by all teachers;

(2) introducing other staff members to each class, so that the students will realize that all teachers have the authority to enforce rules, not just the classroom teacher;

(3) frequently discussing with students what constitutes appropriate behaviour and alternate ways of solving problems; and

(4) involving parents.

### Global Impression

Conduct; supervision. The observers described the students as courteous, mannerly, orderly, and responsible, and remarked on the quality of teacher supervision and the consistency of expectations about student behaviour.

### Summary

Once again there is evidence of the staff working together to identify and resolve problems. The success of their efforts in the area of student behaviour is attested to by the comments of the observers.

## FACTOR I: Teacher-Principal Collegiality

### Interview Topics

Principal-teacher relationship. The principal is described as approachable and always willing to help. The ways in which he helps teachers

on an individual basis include:

(1) suggesting materials, teaching techniques, and the like;

(2) popping into the class regularly, and although these observations are brief, being able to give the teacher useful feedback;

(3) encouraging teachers to try new programs; and

(4) following up on the new programs after he has okayed them, generally by means of a classroom visit, to see how they are going.

The respondents felt that through these techniques the principal not only helps the teachers, but also keeps informed about what teachers are doing and what is going on in the classrooms.

Staff meetings. Staff meetings serve two purposes, information-sharing and problem-solving. The school-wide programs referred to previously were planned at staff meetings. According to the respondents, there is good participation at these meetings.

Staff cohesiveness. The respondents describe staff cohesiveness as very good. Although the teachers spend much of their time working in their classroom, they do get along well, with much laughing and joking.

Global Impression

Staff relations. Although the observers had little opportunity to observe the teachers interacting, because of the amount of time they spent working in their classrooms, they remarked on the high staff morale and the evidence that the teachers worked well together (for example, the common educational philosophy and the consistent expectations for student behaviour).

Summary

The respondents described a variety of means by which the principal works with and helps teachers, as well as citing evidence of staff collegiality and the role staff meetings play in developing and maintaining collegiality. The

comments of the observers attest to the success of the principal in this regard.

## FACTOR 2: Instructional Problem-Solving

### Interview Topics

Instructional emphasis. The respondents gave numerous examples of the staff working together to identify and solve problems affecting the school as a whole, including:

(1) student behaviour;

(2) math skills;

(3) comprehension skills;

(4) vocabulary development;

(5) extracurricular program which reinforces academic skills (e.g., instructional games); and

(6) guidance program

The staff attempted to solve problems in each of these areas by developing school-wide programs, and according to the respondents the rewards of the hard work over the last couple of years are now being seen in the improved behaviour and achievement of the students.

Staff cooperation. The respondents described the staff as very cooperative, sharing ideas, materials, and the like freely, discussing educational matters frequently, and keeping other teachers informed of what they are doing through observing in each other's classes and joint activities.

### Summary

This staff seems to be committed to working together to identify and resolve instructional problems on a school-wide basis.

SCHOOL #7

**FACTOR A: Principal Activities and Style**

Interview Topic

Parental contacts. The respondents described the principal's rapport with parents as "good, on the whole" but found the question difficult to answer because they did not have much opportunity to see him interacting with parents.

Global Impression

The principal. The observers described the principal as hard-working.

Summary

The lack of information provided by either the respondents or the observers makes it impossible to make any general statements about the principal's activities.

**FACTOR B: Achievement, Challenge and Motivation**

Interview Topics

Expectations and efficacy. According to the respondents there is only a small core of parents "who are really involved, who come in to discuss their child's progress, who show interest in new programs." The others may be concerned, but they "stay in the background." There is a wide range of ability among the student population, but student attitude is described as "positive" and "really good." The children are said to "come to school with the idea they are here to learn" and to be "easier to please than other students, appreciative of what is done for them."

Recognition. In addition to recognizing student achievement in the classroom in various ways, there is a formal awards ceremony at the end of the

year to which parents are invited. At the intermediate level a special award is given for academic excellence to a Grade 7 student, and the teachers give about five or six awards per class for various types of achievement. Every primary student receives some kind of certificate.

Homework. No homework is assigned at the primary level. Intermediate students are expected to complete classwork, and occasionally are assigned some drill or practice exercises.

Use of test data. CTBS is administered to students in Grades 3 to 7 at the end of the year, and a standardized reading test is given to some grade levels. The respondents did not comment on the use of test data, except that it is a means of tracing a child's progress over the years.

Global Impression

Academic press. The observers expressed several concerns about the academic press of the school:

(1) the lack of emphasis on books -- there is no library, no book displays, and little evidence of textbooks;

(2) the emphasis on whole class activities, reading to the students, and show-and-tell activities -- there seemed to be a lack of variety, challenge, and stimulation;

(3) the effect of the K/1 split on the Grade 1 students, who have to do their serious work in the afternoon.

The observers also noted that less than half the space is used for instruction, although the module layout is good for instruction. On the positive side, the observers commented that the teachers do not waste any time and that they get the students settled to work quickly.

Summary

While little time is wasted, there is some concern about whether or not the emphasis on academic challenge and achievement is sufficiently high.

## FACTOR C: Warm, Welcoming Environment

Interview Topics

Community support. Although attendance at parent-teacher conferences may be lower than at other schools, attendance at school events such as the Christmas concert is high.

Parents in the school. Some parents volunteer to help out at such school events as Hot Dog Day, but none work in the classroom on a regular basis. Two women run a Values Education program once a week during the lunch hour.

Global Impression

Overall atmosphere. The observers noted the warmth of the interactions, principal-teacher, principal-student, and teacher-student.

Summary

The atmosphere of the school certainly appears to be warm and friendly, which makes the reluctance of the respondents to discuss questions concerning parental contacts and community support inexplicable.

## FACTOR D: Social Contract

Interview Topic

Conduct; discipline policy. The students are described as good, happy, cooperative, fun-loving, and helping, so that supervision is mainly a matter of "milling around."

Global Impression

Conduct, supervision. The observers described the students as well-behaved and quiet.

Summary

There are no problems in the area of student conduct.

## FACTOR 1: Teacher-Principal Collegiality

### Interview Topics

Principal-teacher relationship. The respondents said that the principal pops in and out of classrooms to see what is going on, that he gives recognition for good work, and he suggests programs which are suitable for particular children.

Staff meetings. Staff meetings are held irregularly, about once a month, to discuss such things as the Chrismas concert, gym activities, and supervision. Participation is good. One respondent, however, said, "I feel frustrated that there is no follow-through on many things -- we make decisions and then they don't get off the ground."

Staff cohesiveness. The respondents' comments on staff cohesiveness suggest some underlying tension: "We know the subjects we agree on and disagree on, and carry on accordingly"; "There are no fights"; "There was some tension at the beginning of the year, but it has eased off"; and "A school this size means you really have to make an effort."

### Global Impression

Staff relations. The observers found the staff to be jolly and agreeable, although perhaps not very academic in orientation. One observer noted that there were lighthearted but persistent complaints about supervision duty, and that the smallness of the staffroom and workspace make it difficult to carry out any ongoing group work.

### Summary

From the observers' account, one might expect that staff collegiality was good. The respondents, however, present a different picture. Without indicating the nature of the problem, they do suggest that under the surface all is not as it should be.

## FACTOR 2: Instructional Problem-Solving

### Interview Topics

Instructional emphasis. The respondents suggested that curricular and instructional decisions are essentially the concern of the individual teacher. The only school-wide activity they mentioned was the use of inservice days to discuss educational matters.

Staff cooperation. Cooperation among the teachers was described as good, with much sharing of ideas and materials. No one "hoards ideas."

### Summary

On a one-to-one basis, the teachers are cooperative. They do not appear to do much planning or problem-solving as a group, however, particularly of an instructional or curricular nature.

APPENDIX B:

Report to Schools

# ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SELF IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

## Reports to Schools

April, 1983

This report accompanies the data emerging from the parent and teacher surveys, and the school observations and interviews, all conducted in Fall, 1982. The school by school reports were developed by the nine participating principals, with the project director and research assistant, at a two-day workshop, April 7 and 8, 1983. The reports review the data available, and make suggestions for change where change seems indicated.

## CAUTIONS

Great care has been taken to ensure that the data provided here are both valid and reliable, and that over-emphasis on findings from a single source is avoided. Thus, the conclusions arrived at are fully defensible. However, three major cautions are issued to readers:

1. The Sample - the nine schools here are self-selected and clearly represent the upper end of the range of elementary schools in the province. All comparisons provided here are between a school score and a mean score which is the average score for a very good group of schools.

2. The Scores - the scores shown here are mean scores. When the number of respondents is high, as is the case with all the parent scores, the score accurately represents the ratings of the respondent group. When

the number of respondents is low, as is the case with many of the teacher scores, one person can have a very substantial impact on the mean score, which can be misleading. In general, the teacher scores are less reliable than the parent scores.

In addition, scores on a single item may not be particularly significant. The reports emphasize item clusters within and between factors, for this reason.

3. The Correlations - the survey data, the observation data, and the interviews were all compared to see if they were mutually supportive. This revealed that teachers and parents often have different preferences with regard to school climate. (In Tables 8 and 9, attached, these are represented by negative signs.) Thus, for example, high 'At Task' levels amongst students correlate strongly with CLIMATE I, the overall parent rating of school climate, and even more strongly, but negatively, with CLIMATE II, the overall teacher rating of school climate (see Table 9, row 4, final columns). Consequently, some contradictions are to be expected in the data which follow.

## DATA PRESENTATION

The survey data, on analysis, yielded four parent factors and two teacher factors. A factor is a group of items which are answered in a consistent way by respondents so that there appears to be a unifying construct underlying the responses. Tables 2 - 7 list the items in each factor, and give these factors labels, derived from the cluster of items. All scores provided here are mean factor scores.

## NOTES ON IMPLEMENTATION

Each school will address the implementation problem differently, based on existing conditions. The following steps in implementation may be worth considering:

1. The principal should review the data provided, and the recommendations, very carefully to be sure that he understands these.
2. Principal and staff together should review the data and recommendations.
3. The principal may wish to review the data and recommendations with a parent group.
4. The principal and staff should then review the general recommendations, together with the chart, Effective Schools, Effective Principals, to decide if any specific changes in policies or practices are indicated. These might be divided into minor, or personal changes, and major, or organizational changes.
5. A schedule of activities required by each major change could be developed, and arrangements made to monitor the changes as they are implemented.

The Project Director is available at any time to advise or assist in any of these activities, or others which seem appropriate to the staff as a response to this report.

SUMMARY OF CLIMATE DATA, SCHOOL #1

| CLIMATE ELEMENT & SCORES | CONCLUSIONS OF REVIEWERS |
|---|---|
| A (Parents)<br><br>School=36.0<br>Mean =36.4<br>Diff. = -0.4 | Parent ratings cluster around the sample mean and do not indicate any specific problem area. The teachers, however, express some concern about the principal's:<br>(a) openness, approachability, and availability<br>(b) knowledge of school programs; and<br>(c) treatment of parent opinion. |
| B (Parents)<br><br>School=28.6<br>Mean =30.0<br>Diff. = -1.4 | Parents, and teachers to an even greater extent, express concerns about the school's instructional programs and practices, in particular, whether or not they are challenging, motivating, and interesting. The qualitative data also question the academic press of the school, particularly the limited role of standardized tests and the lack of challenge. In addition the teachers feel that parent expectations for student achievement are low and that students are not proud of the school. |
| C (Parents)<br><br>School=42.5<br>Mean =43.2<br>Diff. = -0.7 | All groups -- parents, teachers, and observers -- question how "welcoming" and "comfortable" the overall tone of the school is. |
| D (Parents)<br><br>School=29.2<br>Mean =29.2<br>Diff. = 0.0 | Discipline does not seem to be an issue -- both parents and teachers support the policy and its implementation. Parents are less sure than the teachers that the parent-teacher relationship is characterized by mutual respect and similarity of goals. Both groups, however, express some concerns about the status of students -- how their opinions are treated, how information about them is treated, and whether or not they are the main concern of the school |
| CLIMATE I | The school score on CLIMATE I is close to the sample mean. The parents' major concern seems to be the quality of the school's instructional programs and practices. They also express some concern about the school's tone, about the parent-teacher relationship, and about the status of students in the school. In addition to the above, the teachers also express concerns about the principal's relationship with the parents and about his knowledge of school programs. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 (Teachers)<br><br>School=43.4<br>Mean =42.1<br>Diff. = +1.3 | Routine "housekeeping" items appear to be dealt with effectively, but less time appears to be spent on instructional and other professional matters. The qualitative data raise questions about staff collegiality and staff cohesiveness. |
| 2 (Teachers)<br><br>School=34.7<br>Mean =40.2<br>Diff. = -5.5 | There is little evidence of instructional problem-solving on a school-wide basis, in either the survey or the qualitative data. |
| CLIMATE II | The school score on CLIMATE II is below the sample mean. Although there are indications that staff cohesiveness is not high, the major problem appears to be the lack of time spent on discussion of instructional and other professional matters by the staff, the lack of instructional problem-solving on a school-wide basis. |

## RECOMMENDATIONS, SCHOOL #1

Perceptions that the principal is not approachable and available may be due to his heavy teaching load. Designating "office hours," times when he is able to meet with others, and publicizing them to parents and teachers may solve the problem.

Student pride in the school might be fostered by:

(a) strengthening the intramural/extracurricular program;
(b) creating a school project, such as a walkathon, a musical, or a spellathon; and
(c) having school T-shirts.

In order to help parents feel more welcome, create opportunities to bring parents into the school; for example, invite them to parent conferences, invite them to meet with the principal in small groups to discuss their concerns, invite them to see their children perform, invite them to be volunteer aides, etc.

Concerns about the parent-teacher relationship might be alleviated if opportunities were created for parents and teachers to meet informally (e.g., potluck dinner).

Discussion of instructional and other professional matters may be increased by:

(a) selecting a subject area, perhaps by analysis of test data, which the staff will work on together to improve the program and teaching practices -- this could be done at staff meetings and on professional days;
(b) rescheduling staff meetings so that more time is available for discussion; and
(c) distinguishing between routine and nonroutine items, and between those which require discussion and those which do not -- use memos, "consent" agendas, and the like whenever possible so that time can be spent discussing nonroutine and professional matters.

SUMMARY OF CLIMATE DATA, SCHOOL #2

| CLIMATE ELEMENT & SCORES | CONCLUSIONS OF REVIEWERS |
|---|---|
| A (Parents)<br><br>School=37.4<br>Mean =36.4<br>Diff. = +1 | The ratings are mixed, although the overall factor score is just above the mean. The qualitative data suggest that the ratings should be better, but also show that the principal is new and has inherited some problems. (Other data suggest that parent ratings improve as principal tenure lengthens.) A possible problem is suggested by the contrast between the positive ratings on A7 and A9, and the rather negative rating on A10. Similarly, the somewhat negative scores on A5 might emerge as a problem. |
| B (Parents)<br><br>School=32.8<br>Mean =30.0<br>Diff. = +3 | In general, the ratings are positive. B9 suggests a very important feature of the school, the high standards set by parents. This emphasis seems to cause teachers some concern, and the teacher responses on B6 and B12 suggest an area for attention. The qualitative data supports this concern shown by teachers. |
| C (Parents)<br><br>School=42.9<br>Mean =43.2<br>Diff. = -- | The school is at or near the sample mean overall and on each item, with the exception of C6, a minor problem which should be attended to. |
| D (Parents)<br><br>School=28.5<br>Mean =29.2<br>Diff. = -- | The school is at or near the sample mean overall. However, D4 and D5 suggest a specific problem, which should be addressed. The qualitative data do not agree. Teachers see this as much more of a problem than do parents. There is some difficulty in supervision, because of the large play area (see C7, Teacher Ratings) which might contribute to this. |
| CLIMATE I | No major changes are needed or desired here. |
| 1 (Teachers)<br><br>School=35.2<br>Mean =42.1<br>Diff. = -7 | There are several difficulties here: grouping policies seem to be contentious, and interruptions of classroom activities. Yet the qualitative data strongly disagrees. There is some possibility that the ratings reflect a 'hangover' from previous years. These data are hard to explain. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2 (Teachers)<br><br>School=41.3<br>Mean =40.2<br>Diff. = +1 | No obvious problems emerge from these data. |
| CLIMATE II | The discrepancies between Factor 1 and Factor 2, and between the ratings and the quantitative data, make convincing interpretation impossible. The small staff, and the principal's newness, suggest that there may be no real problems here. |

## RECOMMENDATIONS, SCHOOL #2

### Factor A

A continuation of the current emphasis on communication with parents should be sufficient to improve these already satisfactory ratings.

### Factor B

Although the school is above the sample mean on this dimension, there is room for improvement, given the strength of parental expectations. More attention to getting the students to work quickly (perhaps by use of a two-minute warning bell), and more emphasis on tests for diagnosis of program needs and intensity is recommended.

### Factor C

Only a minor problem of welcoming visitors, which can be attended to fairly easily, exists in this area.

### Factor D

A joint parent/staff committee should be established to review school discipline policies and their implementation. Agreement on necessary modifications, and the communication involved in the joint activities, should be sufficient to correct this problem.

### CLIMATE I

A continuation of present policies and practices is recommended with two exceptions: some increased academic press is desirable, and a joint parent/teacher review of discipline policies and their application is needed.

Factor 1

There are several problems which should be discussed as openly as possible. The inconsistency between the ratings and the qualitative data suggest that the staff might be split on these issues. An attempt should be made to identify opposing points of view as precisely as possible to work out solutions. An attempt by the principal to provide more assistance to teachers seems to be needed. The primary focus of activity should be to identify the precise nature and size of the problems hinted at in these data.

Factor 2

Overall positive ratings, and the qualitative data, suggest no problems here.

CLIMATE II

An attempt to define problems with precision is suggested. The vague hints of minor difficulties suggested by the data do not justify major changes in current policies and practices in this area.

SUMMARY OF CLIMATE DATA, SCHOOL #3

| CLIMATE ELEMENT & SCORES | CONCLUSIONS OF REVIEWERS |
|---|---|
| A (Parents)<br><br>School=40.7<br>Mean =36.4<br>Diff. = +4.3 | Both parent and teacher ratings are above the sample means, and in many cases are very high. The qualitative data are similarly positive. |
| B (Parents)<br><br>School=33.7<br>Mean =30.0<br>Diff. = +3.7 | Both parent and teacher ratings are above the sample means, and some of the teacher ratings in particular are very high. Much of the qualitative data supports the survey data, although some concern is expressed about the academic press of the school, i.e., the limited use of test data, the apparent lack of classroom planning, and the number of students arriving late. |
| C (Parents)<br><br>School=46.6<br>Mean =43.2<br>Diff. = +3.4 | Both parent and teacher ratings are above the sample means, and in many cases are very high. The qualitative data are similarly positive. |
| D (Parents)<br><br>School=30.5<br>Mean =29.2<br>Diff. = +1.3 | Both parent and teacher ratings are above the sample means, and in some of the teacher ratings in particular are very high. Much of the qualitative data supports the survey data, although the observers do express some concern about the level of supervision. |
| CLIMATE I | Of the 42 items which comprise Climate I, there is only one on which the parent rating falls below the sample mean and many of the school scores are well above the sample means. The teacher ratings are even higher. The qualitative data are similarly positive, except for some concern about the academic press of the school and the level of supervision. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 (Teachers)<br><br>School=48.7<br>Mean =42.1<br>Diff. = +6.6 | The teacher ratings are above the sample means, and most are very high. The qualitative data are equally positive. |
| 2 (Teachers)<br><br>School=45.6<br>Mean =40.2<br>Diff. = +5.4 | The teacher ratings are above the sample means, and are in general high. The qualitative data describe the strong and active role of the principal in instructional and program matters, but provide no evidence of instructional problem-solving on a school-wide basis. |
| CLIMATE II | The school score is well above the sample mean, and many of the teacher ratings are very high. The qualitative data are generally positive as well, except for the concern about the lack of instructional problem-solving on a school-wide basis. |

## RECOMMENDATIONS, SCHOOL #3

Both parents and teachers appear to be very satisfied with the school, and there are no obvious problems. The qualitative data do raise questions about the academic press of the school and the level of instructional problem-solving on a school-wide basis. Staff discussion of areas of weakness, identified by analysis of test results, and of ways to improve these programs and practices would address both problems.

SUMMARY OF CLIMATE DATA, SCHOOL #4

| CLIMATE ELEMENT & SCORES | CONCLUSIONS OF REVIEWERS |
|---|---|
| A (Parents)<br><br>School=27.9<br>Mean =36.4<br>Diff. = -8.5 | There is a marked difference between parent and teacher ratings, with teacher ratings being very high and parent ratings, quite low. The parents appear to be especially concerned about:<br>(a) the principal's relationship with the students; and<br>(b) the principal's manner of identifying and solving problems.<br>They are also concerned about the parent-principal relationship, although to a lesser extent. |
| B (Parents)<br><br>School=30.2<br>Mean =20.0<br>Diff. = +0.2 | Both parents and teachers believe the instructional program is interesting and motivating, but the former group seems to feel that there is not sufficient academic emphasis, a view supported by the qualitative data. In addition, there are indications that parents, and especially teachers, believe that there is a lack of consensus between the community and the school on goals and values. |
| C (Parents)<br><br>School=42.8<br>Mean =43.2<br>Diff. = -0.4 | Parents feel that the school is a safe and happy place for students, but a somewhat less comfortable place for themselves. The teachers, on the other hand, believe that the school is comfortable and welcoming. The qualitative data are very positive, supporting the teacher ratings. |
| D (Parents)<br><br>School=28.5<br>Mean =29.2<br>Diff. = -0.7 | Both parents and teachers appear to be somewhat concerned about the parent-teacher relationship, in particular, the degree of mutual respect and of similarity of goals and expectations. This This feeling of lack of support seems to be more pronounced among the teachers. |

| | |
|---|---|
| CLIMATE I | The school score on CLIMATE I is below the sample mean, due mainly to the low ratings on Factor A, principal style and activities. The parents also express concerns about the academic emphasis of the school's programs and practices, their welcome in the school, and differences in goals, values, and expectations between the home and the school. The teachers share this last concern, but not the first three -- in fact, teacher ratings are high on these groups of items. |
| 1 (Teachers)<br><br>School=38.4<br>Mean =42.1<br>Diff. = -3.7 | There are some discrepancies between the ratings on this factor and both those on Factor A and the interview data. For example, on Factor A the principal is described as approachable and available and according to interview data, as always willing to help, yet the survey item concerning the amount of time the principal spends helping teachers with problems is rated well below the mean. Similarly, the interview data suggests that the staff is very cohesive, collegial, and supportive, yet the survey item dealing with the utility of staff meetings is rated low. This raises questions about the amount of time spent on discussing the specifics of school programs and practices. |
| 2 (Teachers)<br><br>School=38.9<br>Mean =40.2<br>Diff. = -1.3 | Both interview and survey data suggest there is little instructional problem-solving on a school-wide basis. Consistent with this, there is some concern about the role of the principal in the professional development of the teachers. |
| CLIMATE II | Given the high teacher ratings on related items in Factors A and B and the positive tone of the interview data, the relatively low school score on CLIMATE II is surprising. There appears to be little discussion of instructional matters, either between the principal and individual teachers or by the staff as a whole. The principal appears more as a colleague than as an educational leader. |

## RECOMMENDATIONS, SCHOOL #4

Parent concerns about the school's instructional program and practices, and about the principal, may be alleviated if the principal would:

(a) meet with parents, preferably early in the school year, to discuss school programs and practices;

(b) prepare a school handbook which emphasizes school programs and practices;

(c) include discussion of curricular matters and samples of student work in the newsletter;
(d) introduce curricular matters for discussion at parent advisory committee meetings;
(e) encourage teachers to meet with parents to discuss classroom programs and practices; and
(f) demonstrate the success of the program with test results.

In order to help parents feel more welcome, create opportunities to bring parents into the school; for example, invite them to parent conferences, invite them to meet with the principal in small groups to discuss their concerns, invite them to see their children perform, invite them to be volunteer aides, etc.

Discussion of instructional and other professional matters may be increased by:

(a) selecting a subject area, perhaps by analysis of test data, which the staff will work on together to improve the program and teaching practices -- this could be done at staff meetings and on professional days;
(b) rescheduling staff meetings so that more time is available for discussion; and
(c) distinguishing between routine and nonroutine items, and between those which require discussion and those which do not -- use memos, "consent" agendas, and the like whenever possible so that time can be spent discussing nonroutine and professional matters.
(d) formally reappraising the school's philosophy.

## SUMMARY OF CLIMATE DATA, SCHOOL #5

| CLIMATE ELEMENT & SCORES | CONCLUSIONS OF REVIEWERS |
|---|---|
| A (Parents)<br><br>School=42.7<br>Mean =36.4<br>Diff. = +6 | Both the ratings and the qualitative data make it clear that this school has an exceptionally effective principal, whose work with parents is exemplary, in rather difficult circumstances. |
| B (Parents)<br><br>School=27.5<br>Mean =30.0<br>Diff. = -3 | Parents show some mild concerns about the academic press at the school, but only B9 seems really important. However, teachers feel strongly negative about students (B1, B3, B4, B10). Teacher perceptions may be more revealing of high standards than low opinions of students. |
| C (Parents)<br><br>School=44.6<br>Mean =43.2<br>Diff. = +1 | The qualitative data do not support these concerns; the outside observers were impressed with student conduct, urgency, and 'At Task' levels. The parents feel generally positive, and the qualitative data are strongly positive. Teachers again have some negative perceptions. |
| D (Parents)<br><br>School=31.3<br>Mean =29.2<br>Diff. = +2 | Parents and the qualitative data are again positive. Teachers again have some negative perceptions. |
| CLIMATE I | Clearly this is a very superior school, in the perceptions of parents and the external observers. The school has developed ways of coping with potentially serious problems which are working well. Teacher perceptions are obviously a difficulty (see below). |
| 1 (Teachers)<br><br>School=36.9<br>Mean =42.1<br>Diff. = 5.0 | There are some problems apparent in the ratings. 1-1, 1-2, 1-3 and 1-6 all suggest that the principal is very strong, and that teacher involvement is below desired levels. Yet the qualitative data do not agree. This suggests a staff which is divided into factions. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2 (Teachers)<br><br>School=41.3<br>Mean =40.2<br>Diff. = +1 | These ratings are not consistent with those on Factor 1 (cf. 2-1 with 1-1, for example) but are consistent with the qualitative data. |

---

| | |
|---|---|
| CLIMATE II | Factor 1 ratings, together with teacher ratings on a number of items in the parent factors (see A11, D4, D6) all suggest a considerable degree of teacher stress, perhaps resulting from high standards and perceived difficulties with students (see Factor B). |

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS SCHOOL #5

Factor A

Continue present practices to maintain excellent ratings.

Factor B

The negative feelings staff have about students, if translated into low academic expectations, could seriously impede the progress of the school. Every effort should be made to acknowledge the successes of the school and its students.

Factor C

No particular problems requiring change are evident.

Factor D

No particular problems.

CLIMATE I

No recommendations for change seem appropriate since current approaches are working well.

Factor 1

The inconsistency in the data here do not allow a clear recommendation. However, every effort should be made to involve all teachers in decision-making, to avoid the possibility of a split staff, which seems to be indicated by the inconsistency in the data.

Factor 2

No particular problems are evident here.

CLIMATE II

There is at least the potential for problems here. Every effort should be made to reassure teachers that their efforts are being rewarded, and that attempts to reach and maintain staff consensus on all issues will be continued.

SUMMARY OF CLIMATE DATA, SCHOOL #6

| CLIMATE ELEMENT & SCORES | CONCLUSIONS OF REVIEWERS |
|---|---|
| A (Parents)<br><br>School=36.4<br>Mean =30.4<br>Diff. = -6 | The parent ratings are consistently low here. Every item falls below the sample mean, suggesting a general problem rather than a specific one. On the other hand, teacher ratings consistently exceed the sample mean, with three exceptions, and the qualitative data are very positive about the principal's personal style and approach. Items A7, A9, and A10 are negative for both parents and teachers, suggesting a quite specific problem. |
| B (Parents)<br><br>School=30.0<br>Mean =26.8<br>Diff. = -3 | The parent ratings are somewhat below the sample mean, overall and in every item. Again this suggests a general problem. Teachers feel that the school has a strong academic emphasis (B5), but parents do not agree. B3, on which parents and teachers do agree, is the most revealing single item. The school is well below the sample mean on this important item. The qualitative data are not consistent, showing that there is considerable emphasis on awards, although the use of test data is limited. Observation data suggests that this school is low in both student 'At Task' levels, and Student Conduct. |
| C (Parents)<br><br>School=39.0<br>Mean =43.2<br>Diff. = -4 | Again, every item rating falls below the sample mean, suggesting a general problem. C3, C5, C7, and C8, in which parents and teachers agree, suggest a specific and serious problem. However, the qualitative data do not support the survey data. However, a possible explanation is provided -- tension has arisen over the restraint issue, causing both teachers and parents to perceive school environment more negatively that it is viewed by outside observers, who viewed teacher/student relationships at the school as good. |
| D (Parents)<br><br>School=25.0<br>Mean =29.2<br>Diff. = -4 | Every item rating falls below the mean. However, D2 reveals a serious and specific problem which illuminates everything said so far. Linked with D7 and D9 this suggests both the nature of the general problem, and the solution. In addition, there is a specific problem with discipline policies and their application which needs to be addressed (see D4, D5, and the qualitative data). |

| | |
|---|---|
| CLIMATE I | The consistency with which parent ratings place this school below the sample mean suggest a broadly-based disenchantment amongst parents which has no specific focus. However, items in Factor D suggest the cause. |
| 1 (Teachers)<br><br>School=46.2<br>Mean =42.1<br>Diff. = +4 | Teachers are strongly supportive of current practices at the school, with the exception of discipline policies. The positive relationships between the principal and the staff shown in the ratings are reinforced by the qualitative data. |
| 2 (Teachers)<br><br>School=44.9<br>Mean =40.2<br>Diff. = +5 | Again, teachers are strongly supportive of current practices. Only one minor exception to the pattern emerges (2-2) suggesting that the principal might be more assertive in influencing instructional strategies. |
| CLIMATE II | Both ratings and qualitative data make it clear that the staff is extremely cooperative and collegial and that the principal is at least in part responsible for this excellent situation. |

## RECOMMENDATIONS, SCHOOL #6

### Factor A

The general uneasiness about the school and the principal needs to be addressed. The principal should undertake an activity which brings parents into contact with the staff and with himself. His obvious commitment and concern needs to be communicated more often and more forcefully to parents. We recommend a joint staff/parent representative goal-setting exercise in which present parental concerns could be openly expressed and addressed by the principal and staff. (Any similar forum would serve as well.) In general the principal should try to become more assertive and proactive with staff and students.

### Factor B

An increased emphasis on academic concerns, and particularly on communicating these to parents, seems necessary. In particular, student 'At Task' levels in classrooms, and conduct in general, need to be addressed. The goal-setting exercise recommended above could provide parental support for this. Such support is essential.

Factor C

The school environment is not a serious problem which needs to be addressed directly. Previous recommendations are expected to have a positive impact on perceptions here.

Factor D

The magnitude of the gap between teacher ratings on D2 and the sample mean suggest that this is the school's most important current problem, which must be addressed (see below).

CLIMATE I

The school should sponsor a goal-setting exercise which provides an opportunity for parents to express concerns and discuss them with the staff. The principal should take an assertive leadership role in conducting this goal-setting activity.

Once the goals are established, the principal should use these to elicit community support for the school, to clarify expectations, and to strengthen the academic emphasis of the school.

CLIMATE II

The excellent situation amongst staff should be used as the basis for a major effort to improve the school's relationship with the community. The collegial planning and problem-solving emphasis should make the goal-setting exercise with the community relatively easy to conduct.

SUMMARY OF CLIMATE DATA, SCHOOL #7

| CLIMATE ELEMENT & SCORES | CONCLUSIONS OF REVIEWERS |
|---|---|
| A (Parents)<br><br>School=41.9<br>Mean =36.4<br>Diff. = +6 | The parent ratings are very positive, almost without exception. These are the most positive ratings for any school in the sample. However, teacher ratings are contradictory (see Factor 1 for discussion). |
| B (Parents)<br><br>School=35.3<br>Mean =30.0<br>Diff. = +5 | These parent ratings are very positive, without exception. However, both teacher ratings and the qualitative data are much less positive. B5 and B6 suggest a problem, although B3 is reassuring. |
| C (Parents)<br><br>School=47.7<br>Mean =43.2<br>Diff. = +4 | Again the school receives outstanding ratings from parents, the best for any school in the sample. However, teacher ratings are again contradictory, strongly so in C6 and C8. |
| D (Parents)<br><br>School=36.1<br>Mean =29.2<br>Diff. = +7 | Again very consistent positive results from parents. D2 of the teacher ratings may suggest a problem, but the parent ratings and qualitative data are both very positive. |
| CLIMATE I | The very consistent positive responses from parents suggest the existence of a strong halo effect. Parents just feel good about the school and are not discriminating in picking out specific positive features or weaknesses. Thus these responses do not suggest any problems. However, there are major discrepancies between parent and teacher ratings which constitute the basic problem of the school. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 (Teachers)<br><br>School=35.4<br>Mean =42.1<br>Diff. = -7 | These teacher ratings are somewhat negative, with 1-7 and 1-8 being particularly noticeable. The qualitative data support these ratings (see CLIMATE II). |
| 2 (Teachers)<br><br>School=32.4<br>Mean =40.2<br>Diff. = -8 | The ratings here, with the quite consistent qualitative data, make it clear that cooperative and collegial planning for instruction is not a feature of the school. |
| CLIMATE II | The ratings here identify the staff problem with some precision: staff function autonomously as teachers, rather than as part of a school staff with common purposes. |

## RECOMMENDATIONS SCHOOL #7

Factor A

The parent ratings strongly support the continuance of present activities.

Factor B

An examination by staff of the academic emphasis at the school, based on a discussion of realistic objectives for the school, seems necessary. Test scores might help to focus the discussion, and suggest curricular areas for additional attention.

Factor C

Parent ratings suggest no change here (but see Factor 1).

Factor D

There are no problems in this area. Current practices should be maintained.

CLIMATE I

The overwhelmingly good and consistent parent responses make it clear that this school and its present policies and procedures, are very satisfactory to parents. Nothing should be done to jeopardize this situation. (But see CLIMATE II below.)

Factor 1

The teachers seem to be uncomfortable with the principal's allocation of his time (see CLIMATE II for suggestions).

Factor 2

See below.

CLIMATE II

The discrepancy between parent and teacher ratings, already noted, and the clear indications of difficulties in Factors 1 and 2 lead to a single major recommendation. This school staff needs to develop a major area of consensus in a professional (not community-oriented) context, develop a plan to change some aspect of school operation, and work together to achieve the goal.

The area for emphasis should relate to academic press, where staff agree that some change is desirable (see B5, B6, B9, teacher responses). Program development is an obvious possibility. The purpose of the activity is both to increase academic press in the school, and more importantly, to provide an opportunity for joint planning and development, and for the principal to spend more time working with teachers.

SUMMARY OF CLIMATE DATA, SCHOOL #8

| CLIMATE ELEMENT & SCORES | CONCLUSIONS OF REVIEWERS |
|---|---|
| A (Parents)<br><br>School=36.8<br>Mean =36.4<br>Diff. = +0.4 | Parent ratings cluster around the sample means, and suggest there are no particular problems in this area. The teachers, however, express some serious concerns about the principal's knowledge of school programs and manner of dealing with problems. The ratings on Factors 1 and 2 are consistent with this interpretation. The qualitative data are positive, especially with respect to his high visibility and frequency of interactions. |
| B (Parents)<br><br>School=27.9<br>Mean =30.0<br>Diff. = -2.1 | Both parents and teachers express some concerns about the instructional program, in particular, about whether or not it is sufficiently interesting and motivating. The qualitative data also raised questions about the strength of the academic press of the school, especially in the areas of teacher expectations, recognition of student work, and use of test data. |
| C (Parents)<br><br>School=42.4<br>Mean =43.2<br>Diff. = -0.8 | Parent ratings cluster around the sample means, and suggest there are no particular problems in this area. In fact, they may indicate the success of efforts to improve the school's tone, for according to the interview data community support has not been good in the past. The qualitative data are positive, noting especially the warmth and frequency of interactions. |
| D (Parents)<br><br>School=29.4<br>Mean =29.2<br>Diff. = +0.2 | Again parent ratings cluster around the sample means and suggest there are no particular problems in this area. The teachers, however, express some concern about the uniformity of support for and application of the discipline policy, and also about the parent-teacher relationship. |
| CLIMATE I | The parent ratings for CLIMATE I fall just below the sample mean. In fact, there is just one area in which the parents express some concern, and that is the instructional program. This is quite consistent with the qualitative data, which described the school in positive terms on Factors A, C, and D, but which raised questions about the academic press of the school. Teacher ratings are, in general, lower than those of the parents, and express some concerns which occur again in Factors 1 and 2. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 (Teachers)<br><br>School=35.7<br>Mean =42.1<br>Diff. = -6.4 | The factor score is considerably below the sample mean. The major concern appears to be staff participation in decision-making and the role of teachers in problem identification and problem-solving. The survey data is at odds with the qualitative data, which not only fails to detect a problem, but suggests that staff collegiality is high. |
| 2 (Teachers)<br><br>School=35.5<br>Mean =40.2<br>Diff. = -4.7 | Both survey and qualitative data suggest that there is little instructional problem-solving on a school-wide basis. |
| CLIMATE II | The teacher ratings for CLIMATE II fall below the sample mean. The teachers appear to be concerned about: (a) the quality of the school's instructional programs; (b) the amount of instructional problem-solving on a school-wide basis; and (c) the extent of staff participation in identifying and solving problems. |

## RECOMMENDATIONS, SCHOOL #8

The interview data suggests that community support had not been good in the past, but that the principal has been working hard to improve the home-school relationship. The fact that the parents are satisfied generally with the school may be an indication of the success of his efforts and an encouragement to continue them.

The principal should now focus his attention on two other problem areas, the school's instructional program and practices, and staff participation in identifying and solving of problems. One approach might be to strengthen the testing program, perhaps first by clarifying its objectives for the teachers and then using test results to identify areas of weakness.

Then discussion of instructional and other professional matters, and staff involvement in problem identification and solving, might be increased by:

(a) selecting a subject area, perhaps by analysis of test data, which the staff will work on together to improve the program and teaching practices -- this could be done at staff meetings and on professional days;

(b) rescheduling staff meetings so that more time is available for discussion; and
(c) distinguishing between routine and nonroutine items, and between those which require discussion and those which do not -- use memos, "consent" agendas, and the like whenever possible so that time can be spent discussing nonroutine and professional matters.

SUMMARY OF CLIMATE DATA, SCHOOL #9

| CLIMATE ELEMENT & SCORES | CONCLUSIONS OF REVIEWERS |
|---|---|
| A (Parents)<br><br>School=33.9<br>Mean =36.4<br>Diff. = -2.5 | The factor score for parents falls below the sample mean. Parent concerns seem to fall into two categories:<br>(a) the principal's knowledge of elementary school programs; and<br>(b) the principal's relationship with students.<br>Teacher ratings tend to be higher than those of parents. Like the parents, however, the teachers express some concern about the principal's relationship with students. In addition, they seem to be somewhat concerned with the way in which problems are dealt with. |
| B (Parents)<br><br>School=28.2<br>Mean =30.0<br>Diff. = -1.8 | Both parents and teachers appear to have some concerns about:<br>(a) the school's instructional program, in particular, whether or not it is sufficiently motivating and challenging; and<br>(b) the relationship between home and school, in particular, concensus on and support for school goals.<br>The qualitative data support the survey data, and in addition suggest the staff morale is low, for the following reasons:<br>(a) the teachers seem to have low expectations for student achievement;<br>(b) the teachers seem to experience low levels of job satisfaction and a low sense of efficacy; and<br>(c) the teachers do not seem to have reached consensus on school goals, especially concerning the relative importance of cognitive and affective outcomes. |
| C (Parents)<br><br>School=41.6<br>Mean =43.2<br>Diff. = -1.6 | All groups -- parents, teachers, and observers -- express some concern about the overall tone of the school, which appears to be somewhat neutral and lacking in warmth. |
| D (Parents)<br><br>School=29.4<br>Mean =29.2<br>Diff. = +.2 | Discipline does not appear to be a problem, and the parent ratings cluster around the sample means. The teachers, however, feel responsible to the parents on the one hand, but on the other hand do not feel that they enjoy parental support in specific areas such as the discipline policy or even in general areas such as what they want for students. |

| | |
|---|---|
| CLIMATE I | The school score on CLIMATE I falls below the sample mean. Parent and teacher survey data and qualitative data raise concerns about:<br>(a) the school's instructional programs and practices;<br>(b) staff collegiality and involvement in decision-making;<br>(c) the home-school relationship;<br>(d) the principal's relationship with students; and<br>(c) the overall tone of the school. |
| 1 (Teachers)<br><br>School=44.6<br>Mean =42.1<br>Diff. = +2.5 | Both survey and qualitative data raise questions about the way problems are dealt with. It appears that there are a variety of professional issues which are not discussed by the staff, with the consequence that opinions about, and commitments to, certain goals differ. The concern about staff relations may account, in part at least, for this situation. |
| 2 (Teachers)<br><br>School=39.5<br>Mean =40.2<br>Diff. = -0.7 | Neither the survey data nor the qualitative data provide evidence of instructional problem solving on a school-wide basis. |
| CLIMATE II | While the school score on CLIMATE II is slightly above the sample mean, the qualitative data in particular raise concerns about: (a) staff cohesiveness; (b) instructional problem-solving on a school-wide basis; and (c) staff consensus on, or even discussion of, a variety of professional issues. |

## RECOMMENDATIONS, SCHOOL #9

Parent concerns about the school's instructional program and the principal's knowledge of school programs and practices may be alleviated if the principal would

(a) meet with parents, preferably early in the school year, to discuss school programs and practices;
(b) prepare a school handbook which emphasizes school programs and practices.
(c) include discussion of curricular matters and samples of student work in the newsletter;

(d) introduce curricular matters for discussion at parent advisory committee meetings; and
(e) encourage teachers to meet with parents to discuss classroom programs and practices.

In order to get to know the students the principal might:
(a) teach in each classroom; and
(b) create opportunities to meet students individually (e.g., make birthday announcements or recognize student achievement at assemblies).

In order to allay teacher concerns about lack of parental support, the principal might:
(a) inform teachers of parent concerns and opinions -- this information can be collected by
    (1) having a tearoff sheet on the newsletter for parent comment on specific issues identified by the parent advisory council; and
    (2) the principal meeting informally with small groups of parents.
(b) provide the staff with feedback on parent satisfaction.

The low staff morale, low sense of efficacy, low expectations, etc. seem to be typical of what may be called the "inner city school syndrome." A visit to a school which is coping successfully in similar circumstances may be useful.

Staff involvement in a goal setting exercise (e.g., PDK) may help the teachers to learn about one another's opinions and values, may lead to consensus on broad goals, at least, and may stimulate discussion of instructional problems and ways to solve them.

It is possible that increased staff cohesiveness and a warmer, more welcoming environment would result from the above activities.

# EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS, EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS

Peter Coleman

The chart entitled Effective Schools, Effective Principals is based on three recent major, and very thorough, reviews of literature on unusually effective schools and principals [(A) Bossert et al., 1982; (B) Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; and (C) Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981]. Some overlap occurs in the studies reviewed by the three groups of reviewers, but together they, and hence the chart, provide a comprehensive listing of supportable assertions regarding unusually effective institutions. These are categorized by factors used in the project, emerging from the factor analysis of parent and teacher survey responses.

Some categorization difficulties were experienced. The overlap between school and principal columns is fairly severe, illustrating the close relationship between unusually effective schools and effective principals. Similarly, the 'principal activities and style' category tends to be used as a catchall, when the element does not clearly fit elsewhere.

## References

Bossert, S.T. et al. The instructional management role of the principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1982, 18(3), 34-64.

Leithwood, K.A., & Montgomery, D.J. The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 1982, 52(3), 309-339.

Shoemaker, J., & Fraser, H.W. What principals can do. Phi Delta Kappan, 1981, 64(3), 178-182.

1. EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

| | |
|---|---|
| **PARENTS:** | |
| A. PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES AND STYLE | 'conceptualizing goals' (A); 'setting high academic standards' (A); 'making frequent classroom visits' (A); incentives for learning' (A); 'a clearly identifiable instructional leader' (C) |
| B. ACHIEVEMENT CHALLENGE AND MOTIVATION | 'school-wide emphasis on basic skills instruction' (A); 'expectation among teachers that all students can achieve' (A); 'clear instructional objectives for monitoring ... performance' (A); 'students engaged actively in tasks' (A); 'expectations and values emphasizing student achievement; (A); 'school-wide practices for reading instruction' (C) 'stress on reading' (C) |
| C. WARM, WELCOMING ENVIRONMENT | 'open communication with parents' (C); 'attention to atmosphere conducive to learning' (C) |
| D. SOCIAL CONTRACT | 'climate conducive to learning -- one free of disciplinary problems and vandalism' (A); 'structured learning environments with few disciplinary problems' (A); 'maintaining student discipline' (A); 'order, a sense of purpose, relative quiet' (C) |
| **TEACHERS:** | |
| 1. TEACHER-PRINCIPAL COLLEGIALITY | existence of a true consensus on goals (A); 'positive principal/teacher interaction' (C) |
| 2. INSTRUCTIONAL PROBLEM-SOLVING | school-wide coordination of instructional content and sequences (A); 'school-wide promotion practices' (A); 'procedures for placing students' (A); 'integration among program objectives within and across programs and grades' (B) |

**PARENTS:**

A. PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES AND STYLE

'maintain appropriate relations with parents' (A); 'view themselves as instructional leaders whose function is to ensure that students in their schools are provided with the best possible programs' (B); 'develops with teachers ... a "task" orientation rather than a "human relations" orientation' (B); 'collect much information about teachers' (B); 'spent significant amounts of time touring the corridors, briefly dropping in on classes in progress' (B); providing planning time (for teachers) outside the instructional day' (B); 'very active in facilitating communication, between the school and the community' (B); become 'highly integrated into the school community' (B); 'gain community support for school goals' (B); use goals to 'clarify expectations for the implementation of program innovations' (B); 'exceptionally able strategists' (B); 'proactive' (B); manage administration easily (B); 'high expectations of themselves, their teachers, and their students' (C); 'assertive instructional leaders' (C); 'enable teachers to concentrate on teaching' (C); 'obtain political, parental, and financial support' (C)

B. ACHIEVEMENT CHALLENGE AND MOTIVATION

'setting instructional goals' (A); 'developing performance standards for students' (A); 'expressing optimism about the ability of students to meet instructional goals' (A); 'buffer the instructional core from disruptions' in order to maximize learning time (A); 'articulated high expectations for teachers as well as for students' (B); 'are exceptionally clear about their own short and long-term goals for students and these goals usually centre on "the basics"' (B); 'sell parents on the priority awarded student achievement and enlist their active support' (B); 'orients the school program to sets of goals widely endorsed with the community' (B); concerned about 'amount of class time devoted to instruction' (B); 'monitored student progress very closely by reviewing test results' (B); 'oriented toward cognitive rather than affective goals' (C); 'assumed responsibility for evaluating the achievement of basic objectives' (C); 'achievement-oriented leadership' (C); 'set standards of performance' (C)

C. WARM, WELCOMING ENVIRONMENT

'created a productive working environment' (C);

D. SOCIAL CONTRACT

involved in classroom management (A); 'communicating school goals to parents and students' (B); 'disciplinarians' (C);

**TEACHERS:**

1. TEACHER-PRINCIPAL COLLEGIALITY

'discuss work problems with teachers' (A); 'supportive of teachers' efforts to improve' (A); 'support teachers with discipline problems' (A); supportive of special projects' (A); 'help teachers achieve ... goals' (A); acknowledge good work' (A); 'is prepared to sacrifice smooth interpersonal relationships, if necessary, for the sake of a more effective program' (B); attend to staff competence, selection, and placement, and 'organizational arrangements best suited to meet students' needs as opposed to teachers' needs' (B); 'disperse decision-making power ... within a central framework developed by the principal' (B); 'seek staff advice on important issues, encourage participation early in the decision-making process, and continuously through the period of program improvement' (B); 'views the decision-making process as shared' (B); 'establish structures within which participation can be fostered' (B); 'use regular and frequent staff meetings' (B); 'frequent informal classroom observations' (C)

2. INSTRUCTIONAL PROBLEM-SOLVING

'is active and powerful in decisions on curriculum and instruction (A); are skilled in 'the coordination and control of instruction' (A); observe teachers' work (A); set up evaluation procedures (A); establish norms for risk-taking among staff' (B); 'actively concerned about influencing ... instructional strategies' (B); 'focus ... on curriculum goals as the basis for integration' (B); 'give high priority to teachers' curriculum planning' (B); 'express support for new practices related to program improvement' (B); 'arrange for less individualized but carefully structured professional development' (B); 'provide opportunities for teachers to visit and interact with other teachers for purposes of professional development' (B); 'information about classroom instruction is collected in an open fashion and is used to help teachers improve instruction' (B); 'encourage interactions among teachers about professional issues' (B); provide information focussed 'on school goals and program priorities' (B); give 'high priority to curriculum planning and creating planning groups within the school' (B)

APPENDIX C:

Final Drafts, Parent and Teacher Surveys

Spring, 1984

Dear Parents:

You may remember having received and completed a school climate survey a year and a half ago. The project of which that survey was a part is now in its final stages. It is important for us to know your current opinion of the climate at your child(ren)'s school.

Would you please complete the enclosed survey and return it to the school as quickly as possible. This will be very helpful to the school in its efforts to improve school climate.

In order to ensure anonymity, please seal the survey in the enclosed envelope after completion. The school will forward all the completed surveys to me for computer analysis.

Your participation is essential to the winding up of the project; your return of the survey constitutes your permission for us to use the data, under the confidentiality safeguards described. Thank you again for your help.

Your sincerely,

Peter Coleman
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University

PC:em

| 1 | | 2 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|



ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SELF-IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Parent Survey, Spring, 1984

**PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS WITH REFERENCE TO THE SCHOOL FROM WHICH YOU RECEIVED THE SURVEY**

**Directions**

To respond to each item, please insert the number representing the most accurate response, in your opinion, in the box at the right-hand margin.

Select your response from the following alternatives:

(4) Strongly Agree
(3) Agree
(2) Disagree
(1) Strongly Disagree
(0) Can Not Answer - No Knowledge

Please respond to all items.

1. High standards for student achievement are set for all students in our school. [ ] 11

2. The principal in our school is very knowledgeable about elementary school programs. [ ] 12

3. Our school makes visitors feel welcome. [ ] 13

4. Our school provides sufficient information to parents about school programs and procedures. [ ] 14

5. Teachers in our school frequently assign homework. [ ] 15

6. The principal sets a good example for staff. [ ] 16

7. The office staff at the school is helpful. [ ] 17

8. Good discipline is maintained at all times in this school. [ ] 18

9. Students in this school have the necessary motivation to achieve well in basic skills. [ ] 19

10. The principal provides opportunities for open discussion of problems in the school. [ ] 20

11. Students get along well together in this school. [ ] 21

12. School rules and regulations are understood by children. [ ] 22

13. Student achievements are recognized publicly in this school. [ ] 23

14. The principal is 'open' and approachable. [ ] 24

15. Students are proud of our school. [ ] 25

16. Teachers and parents at this school want the same things for students. [ ] 26

17. Parents appreciate the hard work teachers put in at school. [ ] 27

18. The principal deals firmly and rapidly with problems in the school. [ ] 28

19. The physical facilities at our school provide a good environment for learning. [ ] 29

20. Our school provides good information on student progress via reports to parents. [ ] 30

21. Teachers are concerned that students work hard and do not waste time. [ ] 31

22. The principal in our school knows most of the students by name. [ ] 32

23. Parents participate well in the community activities planned by the school. [ ] 33

24. In our school, teachers communicate with parents when necessary. [ ] 34

25. The educational program at our school stresses basic skills in language and mathematics. [ ] 35

26. The principal frequently talks with students around the school. ☐ 36

27. Students feel able to tell teachers when they are having difficulties. ☐ 37

28. Teachers maintain good discipline in classrooms in this school. ☐ 38

29. Our school recognizes student achievement in areas other than academic work. ☐ 39

30. The principal is available in the school most of the time. ☐ 40

31. This school has a comfortable feeling about it. ☐ 41

32. Teachers in our school are consistent in their expectations of students. ☐ 42

33. Students in our school believe that their teachers expect them to do good work. ☐ 43

34. The principal makes sure everyone knows what the school goals are. ☐ 44

35. This school concerns itself with emotional and physical needs of children as well as academic needs. ☐ 45

36. Students believe that the school respects their opinions. ☐ 46

37. Teachers in our school are dedicated to helping children learn. ☐ 47

38. The principal in this school treats parent opinions with respect. ☐ 48

39. Older students help younger ones in this school. ☐ 49

40. Parents are supportive of school discipline policies. ☐ 50

41. Teachers make classes interesting for students in this school. ☐ 51

42. Students in this school respect the principal. [ ] 52

43. Students like the teachers in this school. [ ] 53

44. Punishment for misbehavior of students is fair in this school. [ ] 54

45. Student work is displayed in hallways in our school. [ ] 55

46. My child(ren) participate(s) happily in extracurricular activities at school. [ ] 56

47. Vandalism is rare at this school. [ ] 57

48. The school provides encouragement for students in a variety of ways. [ ] 58

49. My child(ren) is(are) happy to go to school. [ ] 59

50. Parents and teachers respect each other at this school. [ ] 60

51. The school provides instructional programs appropriate to my child(ren)'s ability. [ ] 61

52. Generally, how would you rate the social climate of this school as a place for students to learn in? [ ] 62,
(Enter one response from the scale)

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Excellent Poor

**Now please provide some general information.** (Your replies are still both anonymous and confidential).

53. Please indicate the highest formal educational level attained by a parent living in the household. Use the following scale: ☐ 64

(1) completed elementary school
(2) completed some high school
(3) completed high school
(4) completed some post secondary
(5) completed university degree or equivalent
(6) completed some post-graduate study

54. Considering your total household income for 1981, before any deductions, would you say it was ☐ 65

(1) less than $15,000
(2) between $15,000 and $25,000
(3) between $25,000 and $35,000
(4) between $35,000 and $45,000
(5) between $45,000 and $55,000
(6) more than $55,000

Thank you very much for your help. Please feel free to make any comments about items on this survey which you feel are important on the enclosed sheet. Then SEAL the survey in the envelope and return it to the school as quickly as possible.

COPYRIGHT PEAC Consultants, 15055 Royal Avenue, White Rock, B.C., V4B 1M1, (604) 531-6209

Spring, 1984

Dear Teacher:

The school in which you receive this survey is, as you know, participating in a school self-improvement project, focussing on the social climate of the school. Research in Great Britain and the United States has shown that school climate is a very important factor in encouraging students to learn.

This survey, together with a parent survey and some interviews constitutes the final stage of the project for the researchers. The form is brief and will require only a few minutes of your time to complete. Then SEAL the completed form in the return envelope, to ensure confidentiality, and return it to the office for forwarding to us. The data will be keypunched and the survey form will then be destroyed.

Your participation is essential to the winding up of the project; your return of the survey constitutes your permission for us to use the data, under the confidentiality safeguards described. Thank you again for your help.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Coleman
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University

PC:em

# ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SELF-IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Teacher Survey: Spring, 1984

**PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS WITH REFERENCE TO THE SCHOOL IN WHICH YOU RECEIVED THE SURVEY**

**Directions**

To respond to each item, please insert the number representing the most accurate response, in your opinion, in the box at the right-hand margin.

Select your response from the following alternatives:

(4) Strongly Agree
(3) Agree
(2) Disagree
(1) Strongly Disagree
(0) Can Not Answer - No Knowledge

Please respond to all items.

1. The principal in our school is very knowledgeable about elementary school programs. ☐
2. High standards for student achievement are set for all students in our school. ☐
3. Our school makes visitors feel welcome. ☐
4. Our school provides sufficient information to parents about school programs and procedures. ☐
5. Teachers in our school are willing to work long hours. ☐
6. The principal deals firmly and rapidly with problems in the school. ☐
7. Students in our school have the necessary ability to achieve well in basic skills. ☐
8. Students get along well together in this school. ☐

9. Good discipline is maintained at all times in this school. ☐

10. Teachers in our school spend time with students outside class hours. ☐

11. The principal is available in the school most of the time. ☐

12. Our school day is full of challenging activities for students. ☐

13. Students are proud of our school. ☐

14. Teachers and students at our school show respect for each other. ☐

15. Teachers rarely miss work in this school. ☐

16. Instructional programs between grade levels are well articulated in this school. ☐

17. Teachers are concerned that students work hard and do not waste time. ☐

18. Students feel able to tell teachers when they are having difficulties. ☐

19. Our school provides good information on student progress via reports to parents. ☐

20. Teachers are not very receptive to change in this school. ☐

21. The principal of this school is supportive of the teachers. ☐

22. Parents in this school set high standards of achievement for their children. ☐

23. This school has a comfortable feeling about it. ☐

24. In our school, teachers communicate with parents when necessary. ☐

25. This school is a good place for teachers to work in.

26. The principal encourages teachers to try alternative ways of solving instructional problems.

27. Students in our school believe that their teachers expect them to do good work.

28. This school concerns itself with emotional and physical needs of children as well as academic needs.

29. Teachers maintain good discipline in classrooms in this school.

30. The composition of the school staff here provides a good range of experience and interests.

31. The principal is too busy to take much interest in the instruction going on.

32. Student work is displayed in hallways in our school.

33. Children feel safe at this school.

34. Discipline policies are applied consistently to all children in this school.

35. The work load at the school is shared equally between all staff members.

36. The principal is trusted by the staff.

37. The instructional program in our school helps to motivate students.

38. Students like the teachers in this school.

39. Students are always under supervision while at school.

40. The principal trusts teachers to act as responsible professionals. ☐

41. Students are excited about learning in this school. ☐

42. Teachers know students from classrooms other than their own in this school. ☐

43. Teachers in this school feel they are responsible to parents. ☐

44. Students in this school believe they can do well in school if they work hard. ☐

45. Punishment for misbehavior of students is fair in this school. ☐

46. Vandalism is rare at this school. ☐

47. Parents and teachers respect each other at this school. ☐

48. Teachers and parents at this school want the same things for students. ☐

59. This school reflects the values of the community in which it is located. ☐

50. Teachers support school policies on supervision and discipline in our school. ☐

51. Generally, how would you rate the social climate of this school as a place for students to learn in? ☐
(Enter one response from the scale)

**Now please provide some general information:**

52. How many years (full-time equivalent) of teaching experience have you had, before this current year?

(1) 2 or fewer years
(2) 3 - 5 years
(3) 6 - 8 years
(4) 9 or more years

53. How many different elementary schools have you taught in, either full-time or part-time?

(1) only this one
(2) this one and another
(3) this one and two others
(4) this one and three others
(5) this one and four or more others

Thank you very much for your help. Please return this to the school office, SEALED in the envelope, immediately on completion.

These instruments can be obtained by contacting:

PEAC Consultants, 15055 Royal Avenue, White Rock, B.C., V4B 1M1
(604) 531-6209